HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLIX OCTOBER, 1956 NUMBER 4

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE RUSSIAN MERCHANT CLASS

SOME PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS

SERGE ELISSÉEFF

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

IN THE RUSSIA of my childhood and youth, at the end of the nineteenth century and in the early twentieth, religious attitudes and practices in society as a whole were still those inherited through centuries of tradition in the Russian Orthodox Church. Traditional observances had not yet, as they were soon to be, been widely questioned or neglected. Most orthodox Russians tried to live according to the rules of the Church; but I believe that the merchant class, which included my family, followed established religious practices more strictly than other laymen. Perhaps this was because they were more traditional-minded than the bureaucracy or the aristocracy.

Doubtless, too, the merchants were mindful that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God. To counteract this handicap they were not only meticulous in their piety, but were willing, in order to obtain divine grace, to build churches, to make large donations to monasteries, and to support charitable institutions, called "institutions agreeable to God." Many homes for the aged as well as almshouses and hospitals were built and endowed by wealthy merchant families. Normally each of these institutions included a church with its chaplain. Inasmuch as the building and endowment of such institutions was considered an act of piety, an attitude of modesty required that the family name of the donor should appear only in second place or even be omitted. Instead, the name of the patron saint of the donor was frequently used. One

of the well-known houses for old people in St. Petersburg, founded in 1880, was named "St. Elizabeth House" in memory of the sister of a wealthy merchant. A large and well-equipped hospital built in 1912 was called "St. Helen Cancer Hospital," because the given name of the donor's wife was Helen. Frequently, hospitals were named "Mother of God Hospital" or "St. Panteleimon Hospital," after a Greek saint who was a physician in his lifetime. Many merchants made donations to monasteries so that their Christian names would be mentioned during the Liturgy. Wine merchants very often sent several barrels of red wine for the Holy Communion, and low grade olive oil for the lights which burned before the ikons.

After the death of a wealthy merchant or of a member of his family, the pall which covered the coffin during the funeral service, of a very heavy and expensive golden brocade, was made into sacerdotal vestments and presented to a church or monastery. On the back of the chasuble collar the name of the deceased person was embroidered and when the priest donned it he pronounced a short prayer for the repose of the soul of the departed.

The wealthy merchants not only built churches, but normally served as churchwardens of their own parishes, contributing to the maintenance and embellishment of the church. During the Sunday mass the priest said a special prayer for the sake of those who helped build the church and those who contributed to its adornment. As a child I frequently watched the faces of my uncles or aunts while this prayer was being pronounced, and I was always impressed by the expressions of deep self-satisfaction which I saw there, as if they were saying to God, "Surely we have contributed as much as possible to build the Lord's house."

The uncertainty of a wealthy person's entering the Kingdom of God prompted Russian merchants to give money to the beggars who hung around the church or to those in the streets. Because the prayer of a poor person was thought more efficacious and to travel more easily to Heaven, it was preferred by those who wished to have prayers said for them. But the prayers of innocent children were especially regarded as most agreeable to God, and many orphanages were founded and supported by donations from wealthy merchants so that every morning and evening the

orphans would say a short prayer for the health and salvation of their benefactors.

The clergy was very often invited to the houses of wealthy merchants to perform special religious services, about which I shall speak later, but socially the merchants did not associate with the clergy on an equal footing since they considered themselves a different class. They seldom invited the clergy as their guests.

The relations of the merchants with the Church may be examined under two aspects; personal life as guided by the beliefs of the Orthodox Church, and the pattern of social life under the influence of the clergy. I shall treat first the personal life in which, varying with the age of the individual, different obligations were required from the believer.

Soon after the child was born the priest was invited to come and say a prayer for the lying-in-woman and to bless both child and mother. After two or three weeks, and even earlier if the infant was not very strong, the child was baptized, receiving the first of the seven sacraments of the Orthodox Church. The parents were not present at this service, in order to show complete confidence in the godfather and godmother. Among the merchant class the ceremony was performed mostly at home. A large silver font was brought by the clergy from the parish church and put in one of the reception rooms, usually close to the corner where the ikons were hung. Tepid water was put into the font. Some families possessed a bottle of water from the Jordan River, brought by a pilgrim who had visited the Holy places or by some relative who had gone to Palestine; in this case, some of this Jordan water was added. The priest, the deacon (who in the Orthodox Church is an ordained assistant to the priest) and the sacristan (or chanter) donned their sacerdotal robes, at which time small church candles were given to each member of the family who was present. The child, if a boy, was held by the godfather, and if a girl, by the godmother. The services started by the blessing of the water in the font. This was done by plunging into it the cross which the priest had brought with him. The godfather and the godmother read the creed. Then the chanter read chapter 6, verses 3 to 11, of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans.

3 Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?

4 Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

5 For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection:

6 Knowing this that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.

7 For he that is dead is freed from sin.

8 Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him:

9 Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more death hath no more dominion over him.

10 For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God.

11 Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

After this some hymns and psalms were chanted and the priest read the gospel according to St. Matthew, chapter 28, verses 16–20.

16 Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them

17 and when they saw him, they worshipped him: but some doubted

18 and Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

20 Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.

The priest then took the naked child and covered his mouth and nose with his right hand before plunging him in the water three times, saying: "I baptize you God's slave (name) in the name of the Father, Amen, and of the Son, Amen, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen." After this the priest performed the second sacrament, which is called the chrismation. The chrism, which is a special consecrated oil, was prepared in Moscow once a year during

Passion Week by a group of specially designated priests. It was afterward sent to all orthodox churches in Russia, Bulgaria, Serbia and Rumania. With the chrism the priest anointed the forehead, eyelids, ears, mouth, nostrils, breast, hands and legs of the child, saying each time: "The seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost." Through this sacrament the Holy Ghost is said to enter the soul of the newly baptized child and to provide him with spiritual power for his new life and all his activities. After these two sacraments the priest cut a small tuft of the baby's hair, poured some wax from a candle over the hair and threw it into the font. This was done to symbolize the child's having become God's slave. Then he put on the neck of the child a small cross on a chain, called the "baptism cross" or the "cross worn next to the skin." When this was completed the priest and the godparents holding the child walked three times around the font. This circumambulation signified that from that moment the child became a new member of the Church and was united with the Church forever. It hardly needs to be said that several folkloric elements entered into these two sacraments.

After this ceremony there was an elaborate high tea with hors d'œuvre or a dinner for the clergy and all present.

When the child was forty days old it was brought to church by the parents. When it was a boy, the priest took him in his arms and while reading special prayers entered the chancel and walked around the altar. The altar stood behind the iconostasis, a partition decorated with ikons and could be seen only when the doors were left open. After this the priest brought the child back and the parents took it home. In the case of a girl, the priest left the child on the floor in front of the entrance to the chancel. He then entered alone reading the prayers, and when he came out again he blessed the girl.

In the wealthy merchant families, the parents left the young child in the care of a nurse, very often a wet nurse. After ten or eleven months the child was weaned, but often the wet nurse remained among the servants as a chambermaid. A child lived more with the servants than with his parents. In many cases it was the nurse who taught him his prayers. Every morning, after the child was washed and dressed, he had to repeat the prayers which were

recited by the nurse or, occasionally, by the mother. The sequence of the prayers was well established. It began thus: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, Amen," and was followed by a prayer which started with the words: "Heavenly Father, Consoler of our souls, Who giveth us life and art the distributor of all things, penetrate our heart and protect us from all evil." This prayer was followed by a short one praising the Holy Virgin who gave birth to our Redeemer. The latter was followed by a very short one addressed to the child's guardian angel. After this the child recited the Lord's Prayer, remaining on his knees. The two last prayers were to the saint after whom the child was named, and for the sake of parents, brothers, sisters and all Christians. In the evening, before the child was undressed for bed, the same prayers were repeated. This was always done before the ikons. Very often, in the bedroom or in the children's rooms, there was installed in a corner a kind of image case in which were hung the ikons of Jesus Christ and the Holy Virgin, as well as several others of saints. In our bedroom, where I slept with my elder brother and my next younger brother, there were four more ikons besides those already mentioned: that of Saint Gregory, who evangelized the Armenians; that of Saint Sergius, my patron saint, well known as founder and abbot of Holy Trinity Monastery in the thirteenth century; the ikon of Saint Nicholas, Bishop of Myra in ancient Lycia; and the ikon representing the Apostles Peter and Paul together, the patron saints of Saint Petersburg. In my parents' ikon case was a specially ordered ikon representing sixteen different saints whose names were commonly given to the children in my father's and my mother's families: the Apostles Andrew, Peter and Paul, John the Baptist, Saint Alexander, Saint Gregory, Saint Nicholas, Saint Stephen, and the female saints Mary Magdalen, Anne, Catherine, Elizabeth, Helen, Julia, Sophia and Tatiana. Before lunch and dinner the whole family stood around the table facing the corner where the ikon was placed, and one of the children recited a special prayer, which read approximately as follows: "We all rely on Thee, Lord, Who art sending us our food, opening Thy generous arms and supporting our lives. Amen." After the meals a child would recite: "We are thankful to Thee our Creator, that Thou feedest us

with the produce of the earth and send us Thy benevolence. Amen." For six weeks following Easter Sunday and until Ascension these prayers before and after meals were replaced by the following: "Christ is risen from death and by His death has conquered death, giving eternal life to all who were in the tomb. Amen." This prayer was added also to those recited in the morning and before going to bed.

The children were brought to the church when still in their nurses' arms, and were given Holy Communion. It was quite common for children taking a walk with their nurse to enter a church so that the pious nurse could recite a short prayer before a holy ikon. Before I was able to read I heard from my nurse countless stories about miracles, the lives of saints, and famous monasteries. When I was three years old she was fifty; she had been thirty when she became a nurse in the family of one of our relatives, and knew everything about my ten uncles and aunts and my thirty paternal cousins. She had a condescending attitude toward wealthy people, for she believed that it was practically impossible for them to gain salvation and thought most of them would burn in Hell. She often told me how wonderful Saint Alexis was, he the son of a very rich merchant who realized when he was still quite young that his wealth was an impediment to his going to Heaven. Hence he gave it away to poor people and became very poor himself, but saved his soul.

Pilgrims coming from Jerusalem often visited wealthy merchant families and received generous alms. In my family they were never permitted to go further than the servants' quarters. As a child I liked to go to the maidservant's room to meet the nuns who came from the Holy Land; they told stories about the churches in Jerusalem and presented me and my brothers with small ikons carved in cypress wood, which they said was from the Garden of Gethsemane.

At the age of five, when most children could read Russian without too much difficulty, many new prayers were read, and children's books describing the life of Christ were given them as presents.

The great change came at the age of seven, when the Church regarded the child as having become an adolescent and required

that he be heard in Confession before he could participate in the Holy Communion. Normally the preparation for Confession was done during Passion Week. From Monday on, the children over seven went to church with their parents, attending the morning and afternoon services and fasting. They ate only vegetables, meat being forbidden. In old-fashioned families fish was not allowed during the whole of Lent and no milk or butter was permitted, but coffee or tea was taken with orgeat, an expensive emulsion of almonds. On Wednesday evening or Good Friday evening the children over seven went to Confession, which is the fourth sacrament. The priest stood near a pulpit in a corner of the church. On the pulpit was a New Testament and a metallic cross. The priest wore only a stole. His first words were: "You will tell your sins not to me but to God; I am only a witness. If you hide anything the Holy Communion will bring you no relief; on the contrary, it will be a new sin." After the youth told everything that was on his mind the priest would ask: "Do you have any anger against anybody? Remember that you have to forgive everyone and forget all your animosities; if not, God will not forgive you your sins." The child knelt, and the priest put his stole over the head of the child and placed both hands upon it, saying: "By the power given to me by God I absolve you from your sins." After returning home from Confession, the child read several prayers from the Common Book of Prayers, and took no food.

The next morning, having eaten nothing, the children and parents went to church and remained through the long service of the Liturgy, towards the end of which Holy Communion took place. Before giving Holy Communion, the priest read the following prayer which was repeated by everyone: "I believe and I profess that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, who came into this world to save sinners, of whom I am one. I believe also that this is Thy most precious body and Thy most precious blood. I pray to Thee, have mercy upon me and forgive me all my sins which I committed voluntarily or involuntarily, and permit me to receive the Holy Sacrament without condemnation, that I be absolved from all my sins, and obtain eternal life." Before administering the bread and wine with a small spoon, the priest

asked: "What is your holy name?" The communicant then gave the Church-Slavic form, which was very often slightly different from the modern pronunciation of his name. (Within the family and among friends the Christian names were seldom spoken, usually being replaced by their abbreviations or forms of endearment. Michael became Misha, Nicholas became Kolya, John [Ivan] became Vanya, and so on.) After the Liturgy was over, those who had received Holy Communion had to repeat, in a loud voice, another prayer read by the priest expressing thanks for having received Holy Communion. During this day the communicants were not to make genuflections or to bow to the ground in front of the ikons, because they had received the body and blood of the Redeemer.

The real religious education started at the age of nine or ten when a boy or girl entered a secondary school. About 1900 most of the wealthy merchants sent their sons to "gymnasiums" or "lycées," the eight-year programs of which were established by the Ministry of Education. My first year in a state "gymnasium" began in 1899 when I was ten years old. At 8:45 in the morning a general prayer was offered up by the chaplain of the school in the large recreation hall. One of the pupils read the Lord's Prayer, and the choir sang a hymn. At nine o'clock all the students were in their respective classes, and there again one of the students read a different prayer asking the Almighty to send the Holy Ghost to help the students summon their spiritual strength. After the last lesson of the day, which was from two to three in the afternoon, another prayer was read in which the students thanked God for His help.

Religious instruction in the first year took up three hours each week, and consisted mostly of stories from the Old Testament which were read from a specially prepared manual. Sometimes the pupils read passages from the Bible, and the priest explained the meaning. Special emphasis was placed on the Decalogue, the order of which is different from that familiar in the West, since the Orthodox Church follows the Greek text of the Septuagint.

In the summer between the first and second year, the children were expected to memorize several passages from the New Testament, particularly the entire Chapter 5 of St. Matthew. During

the second year, again for three hours each week, the priest explained the life of Jesus Christ and asked the pupils to recite the eight beatitudes. He also explained in detail the Sermon on the Mount.

During the third year the different religious services were explained, with commentaries on the symbolical meaning of the Liturgy. The students memorized the most important prayers and hymns of the Liturgy and Vespers. The fourth and fifth years were devoted to the study of the catechism in a manual prepared by a Russian archbishop, beginning with a detailed analysis of the Credo. Numerous quotations from the Bible and from the works of the Church Fathers were memorized. The fundamental differences between the Roman Church, the Lutheran Church and the Orthodox Church were explained.

During the sixth year we studied the history of the Church, beginning with the history of the seven ecumenical councils and the problems with which they dealt. The priest explained the development of the different churches, the importance of the Church Fathers, the establishment of monastic orders in the fourth century by Basil the Great, Bishop of Caesarea, the development of the Roman Church, the increasing influence of the popes and, finally, the formal division between the Church of Rome and Byzantium. Some lessons were devoted to the Lutheran Church and other Protestant denominations. During the seventh year we studied the history of the Russian Church, starting with the activities of the Saints Cyril and Methodius who had evangelized the Moravian Slavs. In the eighth and last year a kind of course in apologetics was taught, with discussions of the main points of catechism.

The fifth sacrament in the life of an Orthodox believer was marriage. Class distinctions, of course, had no effect on the essentials of the ceremony. However, wealthy merchants liked to hold the ceremony in a big church and with an impressive choir in order to emphasize their social rank.

The sixth sacrament, which corresponds to Extreme Unction, was very often performed in a merchant family when someone was seriously ill. This sacrament is based on the general Epistle of James, Chapter 5, verses 14–15:

14 "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord:

15 and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

On account of the words to the effect that the Lord shall raise up the sick person, the Orthodox Church never considers this sacrament as an Extreme Unction, which in the Roman church normally would be administered only to a dying person. It was a rather expensive ceremony because normally seven priests with several other clerics were employed in its performance. In our family, several of my relatives received it. Some recovered, others died.

There were special prayers for dying persons which had special names. In general, the services for the dead were very important in merchant families. The more money spent the better, because it indicated the importance of the departed person and the wealth of the family. For three days the dead lay on a table or in a coffin half covered with a pall in the large reception room; all the mirrors were covered with white bedsheets so that the face of the dead person would not be reflected, for it was considered a bad omen should this happen. Several nuns read psalms and prayers without interruption. Three times a day the clergy performed a special half-hour service before the dead, accompanied by a choir chanting funeral songs. All the relatives, friends and acquaintances came to be present during these prayers. The funeral and burial took place on the third day. The open coffin was placed in the middle of the church and after the Liturgy a special funeral ceremony was performed with impressive music by the choir. If the merchant had been a very wealthy and influential person, the Archbishop of Petrograd, the Metropolitan, performed the Liturgy with the assistance of many other priests, hoping that his cathedral was mentioned in the will of the deceased and that the family also would send a large donation for the funeral service.

What was the pattern of a merchant's family life under the influence of the Church? Let us examine this question by following the calendar. In most of the old-fashioned merchant

families the relatives and some friends were invited for a prayer on the thirty-first of December, fifteen minutes before midnight. The priest, the deacon and the reader (in my family my father, my three brothers, and four friends acted as a choir) performed a special thirty-minute service which was one of the so-called "*Te Deum*" where the first hymn which is sung is "We praise Thee O God." The clock struck twelve during the ceremony, so that everybody was at prayer when the New Year started. A light supper, usually with champagne, followed, though in some merchant houses no vodka or wine was served. On the first of January we always went to hear the Liturgy in order to continue the New Year with prayers. It was the commemoration of the circumcision of our Lord.

An important Holy Day on the sixth of January was the celebration of Jesus Christ's baptism. After the Liturgy a special service followed. A vase made from a barrel sawed in half and painted dark green, filled with water, was brought in and placed in the middle of the church and after many prayers and genuflections the priest plunged a cross into the water three times, thereby blessing it. When this service was over, all the parishioners approached holding bottles or other containers to receive the holy water. In our church my brothers and I always took part in filling the bottles. Very often in other churches the young sons of the church wardens, who were merchants, helped with this holy water distribution. In towns and villages where the rivers were frozen a special service was held on the ice of the river. A large hole in the shape of a cross was cut in the ice; this hole was called the Jordan. In front of it, on a small table, were placed the New Testament and an ikon representing Christ's baptism, before which the service was performed. At the end of the prayer the priest, or the bishop if the city was an important one, remained on his knees and plunged the cross three times into the river. Many of the men present dived into the icy holy water. My nurse, with great admiration in her voice, told me that my grandfather used to dive into the Neva river in the "Jordan" hole cut in the ice in front of the Imperial Palace. Coming home wet under his fur coat he would drink three glasses of hot tea. (In our house wine and liquors were served only to guests.) I

remember that when I was a boy some of the clerks of our wine shop had dived into this icy holy water.

On February 2, Candlemas Day, the family went to church; our elders explained to us children that this was a great day because the baby Jesus Christ was brought into the temple forty days after his birth and Saint Simeon recognized him as the child of God.

Toward the end of February, carnival week took place. This was the last week before the so-called Great Lent preceding Easter (there being three other lesser Lents in the year). During these seven days everyone made every effort to enjoy himself and special pancakes with caviar, smoked salmon and sour cream were eaten. The "Sunday of Mutual Forgiveness" followed. As children we went to lunch at our grandmother's. After the meal and before leaving we said to her: "If I have offended you please forgive me who am the sinner:" The old lady kissed us, saying: "God will forgive you." As soon as we came home we went to our parents' room, where in front of the ikons our father read the prayer of Saint Ephraim, a Syrian priest (who died in A.D. 373): "God and Lord of my life, deliver me from laziness, from loss of courage, from love of power, and from idle talk." After this first verse, Father, Mother and the children bowed to the floor. Father continued: "Give me, Thy slave, the spirit of chastity, humility, tolerance and love." We all bowed to the floor again and Father continued: "O Lord, O my God, help me to see all my sins and not to accuse my neighbour. For Thou art blessed from everlasting and to everlasting. Amen." And for the third time everybody knelt and bowed to the ground. Then each of the children, beginning with my elder brother, knelt before our father, bowed to the floor, and said: "Please forgive me who am a sinner." Father kissed us each in his turn and said: "God will forgive you." The same kneeling, bowing, and asking forgiveness was done before our mother. After this we all went to see the servants in their respective rooms and asked them to forgive us if we had offended them, and everybody answered with the same phrase, "God will forgive you."

On Monday morning the Great Lent began. The whole atmosphere of the house was different. No noise, no laughing. To play

the piano was forbidden. Mother, the housekeeper, the nurse and all the maidservants were dressed in dark colors and no guests came to see us. We stayed at home during the whole of the Great Lent. The food we ate was radically different. No milk, no butter, no eggs, no meat, no chicken, no fish even, were served during the first week of the Great Lent. Everything was boiled or fried in hemp oil or some other vegetable oil. Even by the street smells you could tell that it was the time of the Great Lent; besides, you would observe that most of the butcher shops were closed.

The Imperial Opera and Drama were closed for seven weeks, and private theatres were opened only during the second, third, fifth and sixth weeks of the Great Lent. Pious old-fashioned merchants stayed at home. There were no parties, no dinners or any other merriment. In my family, during the second and third weeks, certain stringencies were temporarily relaxed; the children were permitted to practice the piano and fish was served, but no butter or milk was used. During the fourth week the fasting was again very strictly observed. These seven days were called the "Holy Cross Week"; special hymns were sung during Vespers and Liturgy, and in the middle of the church the cross was exposed on a lectern. During the first and fourth weeks many merchants' wives went to Confession and on Saturday or Sunday took Holy Communion.

The most important week was the seventh, Passion Week. In the house all the servants were busy cleaning the rooms, waxing the floors, washing everything, and polishing the silver before the "Feast of the Feasts," Easter Day. In the kitchen the chef, assisted by the fifteen-year-old scullion, was busy preparing the special cottage cheese cakes, *kulich* (a kind of sponge cake), and baked turkeys and hams. The maidservants and we children were busy painting or dyeing Easter eggs.

On Saturday night of the seventh week the important Easter service was celebrated. It started at 11:45 with a procession bearing a cross, banners and ikons. The merchant who was the church warden, together with the male members of his family, participated in this procession carrying a large cross, the Holy Gospel, and the most venerated and important ikons. As benefactors of

the church they occupied prominent places in the procession which could not leave the parishioners unaware of their influential position. In my youth I participated in the Easter procession each year with my uncles, my father, my cousins, and my brothers. After coming out of the church we circumambulated it three times, carrying the lantern, the cross, the ikons and other holy relics. After the third circumambulation we all halted on the parvis, where the priest, surrounded by the other clergy and lay members of the procession, declared: "Christ is risen!" Thereupon the choir began the Resurrection hymn. Led by the clergy, the procession entered the church, and the ikons and relics were placed on lecterns intended for that purpose. The Liturgy began and the wealthy merchants with their families lined up in the place of honor near the altar. At three o'clock in the morning the service was over and everyone went home to an epicurean supper.

Beginning at noon on Easter Sunday the clergy of the different churches (sometimes with a small choir) began a round of visits to the merchants' houses. In each house an ikon of Resurrection was placed on view in the reception hall on a table or on a lectern. The visitors sang before it the Easter hymns, after which they received a small envelope with a fairly sizable donation. I remember how in my parents' house these visits began at twelve o'clock and continued practically without interruption until seven in the evening, a different group arriving about every quarter hour. The hymn "Christ is risen" was always the same, the only variation being in the voices of the clergy from different churches.

The twenty-third of March was Saint George's Day, on which a special religious service was performed in our stables. It was a *Te Deum* with the blessing of the water, the dark rye bread, and the sugar. After the service was over, the priest, holding the cross in his left hand and in his right hand the aspergillum, which was a kind of brush, sprinkled the horses with holy water, and we children were delighted to give our horses a piece of blessed bread and a lump of blessed sugar.

An important holiday was Ascension Day which always falls on a Thursday. The whole family went to church. During the Liturgy the priest read the last eighteen verses from the Gospel according to St. Luke (Chapter XXIV, verses 36–53), at the

end of which it is written "and it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them and carried up into heaven."

It was in May, soon after Ascension Day, that the examinations were given in the schools. On the Sunday before examination week my next younger brother and I, accompanied by one of our butlers, used to go on foot to the church of a miraculous ikon of the Holy Virgin. It was so far from our house that it took three hours to get there and back, and for us it was a kind of pilgrimage. We prayed the Holy Virgin to help us during the examination period. At the intersection of a wide boulevard and the street where the "gymnasium" was located stood Saint Andrew's Cathedral. Every morning when I was about to take an examination, I would hurry into the Cathedral and go to the right side of the altar where there hung a large ikon of the Saints Cyril and Methodius. I put a candle in front of the ikon and prayed to the two scholar saints to help me in my examination. When it was in mathematics or history I bought a fifty-kopeck candle; when it was in Greek or Latin, which I knew better, I considered that a twenty-five-kopeck candle would be sufficient. On the mornings of the French and German examinations I simply kissed the ikon, anticipating no difficulty. This kind of ritual, which I abandoned when I was sixteen years old, gave me a feeling of assurance and tranquility.

Before Holy Trinity Day, the fiftieth after Easter, all the female members of my family were busy because the interior of the church had to be decorated with fresh green birch branches and the numerous lecterns bearing the ikons decorated with flowers. On Sunday everybody came to the Liturgy carrying a flower, which they held throughout the service.

Many merchant families had churches near their summer houses, or were church wardens of the church in the nearest village. During the summer, life continued to be influenced by the Church. Our servants started to fast on the fourth of June, four weeks before the commemoration day of Apostles Peter and Paul. My younger brother was named Peter so the twenty-ninth was considered his saint's day and he received presents. After the Liturgy a special *Te Deum* was celebrated with prayers addressed to the Apostles.

The fifth of July was the commemoration day of Saint Sergius, and it was my saint's day. The Liturgy was celebrated and a special *Te Deum* performed. Practically every ten days someone's saint's day occurred in the family, and was celebrated in our church. The choir consisted of my father, myself, and my three brothers and cousins, who stayed with us during the summer, together with some friends. When I reached fourteen and my voice changed, the family doctor advised me to stop singing. Instead, I helped the priest at the altar, and at the beginning of the Liturgy read aloud passages from the Epistles of the Apostles.

Omitting the less important holy days, I should like to mention the Holy Transfiguration which was celebrated on the sixth of August. In most merchants' and farmers' families certain fruits such as apples or pears were not eaten until the sixth of August. After the Liturgy on the Day of Transfiguration the parishioners brought baskets of fruit to be blessed by the priest. The last important holy day during the summer vacation was the fifteenth of August, the Assumption of the Holy Virgin. Thirty miles from our summer house in Estonia was a large nunnery, of which the main church was dedicated to the Assumption of the Holy Virgin. It was customary for us to start early in the morning to arrive there for the middle of the Liturgy, and afterwards to have dinner in the Mother Superior's quarters. Merchant families were welcome guests in nunneries and monasteries, because each visit offered an opportunity for the Mother Superior or Abbot to ask for some further contribution. Many merchants made a practice of visiting well-known monasteries, where they were always cordially received and stayed in the best rooms of the guest houses.

I should mention briefly that the Nativity of the Holy Virgin and the commemoration of the finding of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem by Queen Helen were important holy days celebrated in September. On the first of October was celebrated the Feast of the Intercession of the Holy Virgin, which is, as far as I know, celebrated only in the Eastern Church. The cult of the Holy Virgin has a slightly different meaning in the Orthodox Church and in the Roman Catholic. After the death of Christ, the Holy Virgin lived with Saint John, his most beloved disciple. The Russian patriarchs believed that the Roman Church, of which the Apostle

Peter was the head, would not always be dominant, but that the leadership would eventually come to the Eastern Church of which Saint John was the head; and with him would come the Mother of God. This explains why the most important churches in Russia were named to commemorate different events in the life of the Holy Virgin. The merchants who supported many of these churches particularly celebrated these holy days. The business house of my family was founded on the twenty-second of October, 1813, on the day when the miraculous ikon of the Mother of God of Kazan is worshipped and on this day the so-called "Virgin Mary *Te Deum*" was celebrated. During these *Te Deum* Chapter 1, verses 39–49, of the Gospel according to Saint Luke was read:

> And Mary arose in those days, and went into the hill country with haste, into the city of Juda; and entered into the house of Zacharias, and saluted Elisabeth. And it came to pass, that when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost: and she spake out with a loud voice, and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy and blessed is she that believed: for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord. And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour for he hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden: for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed, for he that is mighty hath done to me great things; and holy is his name. And Mary abode with her about three months, and returned to her own house.

On the fifteenth of November began the pre-Christmas fasting period, which was not as important as the Great Lent, but was still observed in merchants' families. The twenty-fourth of November was the holy day commemorating the presentation of the Blessed Virgin. It was considered an important religious day because it was the Blessed Virgin who gave birth to our Redeemer. During the evening service which was performed after five or, usually, after six o'clock, was chanted the hymn: "Christ will be born, glorify Him. Christ is descending from the heaven, welcome Him." In the morning service, Chapter 11, verses 27–28, of the

Gospel according to Saint Luke, were read: "and it came to pass, as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. But he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it."

In the shops of many merchants were hung ikons of the Holy Virgin belonging to different iconographical types, and side by side with them was placed the ikon of Saint Nicholas, Bishop of Myra, protector of all travelers and therefore traditionally the protector of merchants, who in ancient days were forced to travel. The sixth of December was Saint Nicholas' holy day, and in many shops a *Te Deum* was celebrated before the ikon. The merchant, his family and all the employees and salesmen were present. The service began with prayers which were followed by the reading of Chapter X, verses 9–16, of St. John's Gospel:

I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture. The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep, but he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling and careth not for the sheep. I am the good shepherd and know my sheep and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep. And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.

Special prayers addressed to Saint Nicholas were read by the priest, and the choir chanted "Holy Father Nicholas, pray God for us." Towards the end of the service the water, which was in a silver container on a small table before the ikons, was blessed. At the end of the *Te Deum* everyone knelt and the priest, remaining on his knees, read a long prayer addressed to Saint Nicholas. This prayer was called *acathistus*. When the service was ended the priest sprinkled the shop and all the offices with holy water.

Christmas was celebrated by all Orthodox Russians in the

same way. An evening service was performed on the twenty-fourth and a Liturgy on the twenty-fifth of December. In all houses Christmas trees were decorated and children received presents. The only particular custom which I should mention is that when I was a child we fasted all day on December 24. In the morning we had a glass of water, then we and all the servants ate nothing until the first star appeared in the sky, which in St. Petersburg was around five o'clock. We then had tea and sandwiches with sardines or smoked salmon, but no meat or ham.

Outside the established holy days, the commemorative saints' days, and the services connected with the holy patrons of the shop, there were many other occasions on which the merchants chose to celebrate a *Te Deum* at home, usually involving the blessing of the water and sprinkling it over the heads of the believers, so that it would protect them. When someone had been ill and recovered a *Te Deum* was sung. This was done also before beginning the school year, after a house was remodeled or enlarged, or before starting a new business. A special Thanksgiving Service was held if the business was prosperous. A *Te Deum* was also sung when someone was going on a journey and on many other occasions as well. When the water was blessed in the course of such a service, the priest read Chapter V, verses 2–4, from Saint John's gospel:

> Now there is at Jerusalem by the sheep market a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches. In this lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.

Many days of the year were occupied by attending burials or commemorative services for grandparents, great grandparents, uncles and aunts, and the children were expected to be present on these occasions. Some of the wealthy merchants had their own good-sized churches in the graveyards outside the city, and in the crypts beneath them the members of the family were buried. The funeral of a wealthy merchant was an important event because the manner in which it was done and the number of clergy who

were present indicated the social standing of the family. I remember the story, told to me by my nurse, about the funeral of my grandfather in 1892. She spoke of the impressive oak coffin covered with a gold brocade pall and of how beautifully the three choirs sang — how magnificent was the religious service performed by the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg with all the high clergy. It was wonderful to see all the relatives and well-known merchants walking behind the chariot driven by six horses. But, she added: "The really moving thing was the enormous crowd of beggars and poor people who followed the coffin. No one will forget how charitable your grandfather was. I wish him to be in heaven, although in the gospel it is said: 'But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation.' " The disintegration of all these customs and traditions started soon after the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905). Russian society lost its stability; the younger generation which was better educated felt no necessity to follow these merchant class traditions. Many sons of businessmen became officials, diplomats, or scholars.

STUDIA DIVINA IN VITA HUMANA

On Cicero's "Dream of Scipio" and its place in Graeco-Roman Philosophy

GEORG LUCK

Harvard University

In the first book of the Tusculanae, and in the last book of De Republica, Cicero has left us two notable documents in the development towards later views of the soul and the hereafter. Both works are among his best; both are composed with care, neither is a random compilation of doxographical material. In the Somnium Scipionis, the language of the dream reflects with particular persuasiveness the impulse of the soul to take wings and fly away into the ever-calling unknown. But the essential doctrines of both works are the same: the hereafter in its reality, as a return to the beginning of things, as the true life; and the death of kings and philosophers as a robing, a sacred investiture.

Many of the secondary themes [1] found in both works are obviously quite commonplace in Cicero's time; yet their tendency and certain more or less explicitly stated assumptions are, if not completely new in themselves, at least presented in a new light. Since the scarcity of first-hand Greek texts makes our knowledge of Hellenistic philosophy so inadequate, it seems desirable to identify the main themes of the Somnium and Tusc. I, to transform, as it were, anonymous ideas into a new chapter in the history of late Greek thought. In this paper, we shall limit ourselves to the Somnium; needless to say that a similar method, yielding similar results can be applied to Tusc. I.[2]

Strictly speaking, the themes of the Somnium are neither Pla-

I am deeply grateful to Arthur Darby Nock, my teacher, colleague, and friend, for his criticism and kind encouragement.

[1] Death is a *peregrinatio*, Somn. 9f. 15 (the Platonic *poreia*, see Apol. 40E), a return to our real home, Somn. 20.29 (cf. Tusc. 1,72.5,9), whereas what we call life is actually death, Somn. 14, an imprisonment of the soul in the body (Plato, Phd. 67D.Arist., Protr. fr. 10b W.). These concepts appear quite frequently in Hellenistic popular philosophy, cf. the pseudo-platonic Axioch. 365E. Virg. Aen. 6,734 and in general P. Boyancé, Etudes sur le Songe de Scipion (1936), 126 f.

[2] K. Reinhardt, Pauly-Wissowa 22 (1953), 575–586 s. v. 'Poseidonios,' in a detailed discussion of Tusc. I, stressing its parallels to the Somnium, has main-

tonic, nor Aristotelian, nor Stoic, but rather they are common to all three schools, without being — and this is important — characteristic of one of them in particular.[3] Its general tendency is to minimize the differences between the great philosophical schools in favor of a broad imaginative synthesis that might appeal to the educated Roman who refused to be bothered by the fine-spun theorizing of controversial Greek dogmas.

First of all, it is clear that Cicero has transformed a Platonic theme into something new. Like the myth of Er that crowns Plato's Republic, the Somnium is a vision of after-life. The central idea in both texts is the great statesman's just claim to immortality. There are, however, considerable differences in the manner in which this idea is presented. Cicero has transformed Plato's straight narrative into a dialogue. He does not state as explicitly as Plato did that kings must be philosophers and philosophers kings. For Cicero, the great statesman is the living embodiment of the Universe as a natural order, thus fulfilling on earth the function of the Cosmic God. On the other hand, Plato does not place the ultimate destiny of the soul in the celestial spheres.[4] Cicero's description of these spheres suggests familiarity with the research of Hellenistic astronomers.[5]

In a text which was meant to rival a famous Platonic work, these changes are surprising. We may wonder whether they are

---

tained that this book reflects the thought of Antiochus of Ascalon. Independently and almost simultaneously, H. Strohm, "Studien zu der Schrift von der Welt," Museum Helveticum (1952), 137 ff. and G. Luck, Der Akademiker Antiochos (1953), 36 ff. have come to the same conclusion.

[3] For details see H. Usener, Rhein. Mus. (1873), 397 f. R. Harder, "Ueber Ciceros Somnium Scipionis," Schr. Königsb. Gel. Ges., 6,3 (1929), 15. R. Philippson, Philol. Wochenschr. (1930), 1209. O. Seel, ibid. (1938), 489 f. M. Pohlenz, Die Stoa 2 (1949), 132.

[4] But see, e.g., the pseudo-Platonic Axiochus 366A. Its close relationship to the Somnium deserves a special study; some points of view in M. Meister, De Axiocho dialogo (Diss. Bresl. 1915).

[5] This last point, taken by itself, would not justify our hypothesis that the Somnium is based on the (lost) work of a Hellenistic philosopher. A. D. Nock, "Sarcophagi and Symbolism": AJA 50 (1946), 163 f. has shown that, in Cicero's time, there was a great familiarity with astronomy. The subject was taught at schools. Aratus' poem was widely read and translated into Latin. A man like Galen was thoroughly at home in astronomy (Scripta minora 1,32 Marquardt). Cf. also G. M. A. Hanfmann, The Season Sarcophagus in Dumbarton Oaks, vol. 1, 1951, 124.

due to Cicero personally [6] or, perhaps, to his adaptation of an unknown Greek treatise. We shall suggest below that the second solution is more plausible. It would be unfair, of course, to deny that Cicero had a mind, a personality and a style of his own. He was not, and did not claim to be, an original philosopher, but when he writes on the good statesman, we should expect a little more from him than a mere reproduction of the thought of the Greek philosophers he had heard or read.[7] For the time being, let us only say that the Somnium as a whole reveals an unusually broad knowledge of classical and post-classical Greek thought. Unlike the majority of Cicero's philosophical treatises, it is *not* doxographical in character, i.e., it does not, like De Finibus or De Natura Deorum, confront and compare the tenets of various schools. In a manner that reminds of Cicero's smaller treatises, e.g. De Amicitia, or De Senectute, it approaches an important subject imaginatively, or even poetically. Wilamowitz called it "eine schöne Dichtung," meaning that it is essentially a literary work of art. For this very reason, an investigation of its "background" or its "sources" is particularly difficult.

The concept of the statesman in the Somnium is characteristic for the skillful blend of various philosophical doctrines which we have noted above. It would have been unrealistic in Cicero's time to identify the philosopher and the statesman. More than that — it was unnecessary, since the Stoics had maintained that the life of action, *bios praktikos*, was the best. This view, attractive enough to a Roman reader, embodied into a cosmic myth, would have been perfectly acceptable at the conclusion of De Republica, especially since the whole work shows a strong Stoic influence. If Cicero, in writing the Somnium had followed a Stoic philosopher, he would have simply glorified the life of action.

Instead, he praises the practical *and* the theoretical life as

[6] It is the concept of the *ratio quasi deus* (where *ratio* stands for the cosmic *Nus*, W. Theiler, Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus, 1930, 44) that underlies the Somnium. If Cicero had intended the Somnium as a summary of his own political thought, he would have stressed more strongly the individual *ratio* as the agent responsible for the highest human achievements (H. Leisegang, Philol. Wochenschr. 1938, 1310); he does this only in the books of De Rep. and De Off. which are influenced by Panaetius (R. Philippson, ibid., 1930, 1175), but not in the Somnium and not in De Leg. I where the influence of Antiochus is reasonably certain (Luck, op. cit., 69 ff.).

[7] See the remarks of A. H. Armstrong: Gnomon (1954), 485.

equally valuable. He declares that not only statesmen and military leaders, but philosophers and poets as well are rewarded by an eternal life of happiness in heaven. In raising the life of pure speculation, *bios theoretikos*, to the highest place, he follows Plato [8] and Aristotle,[9] perhaps also Posidonius.[10] Although he abandoned the Platonic ideal of the statesman-philosopher, he refused to make a choice between the two ways of life, but coordinates them instead, "and this was bold enough an adventure in those days." [11] In a very significant passage of the Somnium, the connection between the theoretical and the practical way of life is clarified (16). How will Scipio be able to follow his ancestors on the road to heaven? The answer is: By observing *iustitia* and *pietas*. But how will he realize the meaning of these two virtues? By the contemplation of the heavenly bodies!

This singular concept has a close parallel in De Finibus 4, 12, a book which is strongly influenced by Antiochus of Ascalon.[12] There we are told that the contemplation of the Universe is the foundation of *megalopsychia* and *dikaiosyne*. In other words, the good conduct of life is inseparable from physical research or metaphysical speculation. Therefore, all men who have led a life of the intellect on earth, will be rewarded after their physical death (which is a spiritual rebirth) by celestial immortality.

Among these men, whose life on earth is a "life of gods" (Tusc. 1, 72), we find the inventor of the alphabet, the first astronomers, those who first taught their fellowmen to build houses and to cultivate the fields (Tusc. 1, 62), as well as the great poets and musicians, in short, all those who *praestantibus ingeniis in vita humana divina studia coluerunt* (Somn. 18). Their rôle on earth is thus comparable to that of the statesman and general;[13] and their achievements on earth, reflecting the divine

[8] Plato, Apol. 40 f. and — already taken for granted — in the Axioch. 371C.

[9] Arist., Protr. fr. 12 W., quoted in Cicero's Hortensius, and in later eclectic literature, e.g., Cicero, Tusc. 1, 43 ff. 62. 73. De Fin. 2,51. 4,12. 5,48 ff.

[10] On the background of Sen., Epist. 90 and Manil., Astr. 1, 66 ff. see F. Boll, Jahrb. f. Philol. Supp. 21 (1894), 221 ff.

[11] L. Edelstein, AJP (1938), 363. He is the first scholar who has without qualification ascribed the Somnium to Antiochus.

[12] R. Hirzel, Unters. z. Cic. philos. Schr., 2 (1880), 657 ff. R. Philippson, s. v. 'Tullius': Pauly-Wissowa 7A (1939), 1137 ff. G. Luck, op. cit., 57 ff.

[13] The promise of eternal rewards to those who served their country, is a well-known Platonic theme (Phd. 82 A/B. Rep. 615 B). It may seem tempting, for a

origin of their soul, mark them as representatives of the cosmic principles of order and justice.

In coördinating the statesman and the philosopher, and in mediating between the Stoic ideal of action and the Platonic-Peripatetic ideal of pure knowledge, Cicero clearly honors the philosophy of the Scipionic circle whose members play such a prominent rôle in the whole of De Republica. This philosophy had been formulated by Panaetius of Rhodes, the founder of what is known as Middle Stoicism and a close friend of Scipio Aemilianus.[14] His brilliant student Posidonius of Apamea, whose glory in later days overshadowed that of his master, taught that the first philosophers were the first kings and lawgivers.[15] This doctrine of Posidonius, as well as many others, marks a decisive return of Stoicism to Platonism.

It is fairly certain that Panaetius had written a book on political science. Cicero knew this treatise when he was working on De Republica and borrowed a few important concepts from it.[16] But when it came to the definition of the best way of life, Panaetius was not so much *philoplaton* and *philaristoteles* as a Stoic of the old school. For him, the life of pure speculation was justified in an individual who showed exceptional gifts and interests; but since man is a "political animal," the best life is a life of action in a concrete political community.[17] For Panaetius, the beauty of the world is a reality, something that can be experienced here and now and every day, not, as the Somnium would have it, only after the ascension of the soul to the celestial spheres. There is

---

moment, to connect it with the cult of the ruler as benefactor and savior, but A. D. Nock, "Soter and Euergetes," in: The Joy of Study, ed. by S. E. Johnson, 1951, 122 ff. has shown that the word *soter*, when applied to a man, did not necessarily suggest that he belonged or even approximated to the category of the gods.

[14] Latest competent discussion by M. Pohlenz, s. v. 'Panaitios,' Pauly-Wissowa 18 (1949), 418 ff.

[15] Sen., Epist. 90,5 f. Manil., Astr. 1,762 ff. See F. Boll, loc. cit. A. J. Festugière, La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste 2, 1948, 443, n.2. F. Cumont, Lux Perpetua, 1949, 174.182).

[16] R. Reitzenstein, Nachr. Gött. Ges. (1917), 399 ff. M. Pohlenz, Gött. Gel. Anz. (1938), 134 and Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. 'Panaitios,' 437. The definition of the state in De Rep. 1,39 (cf. 40 f. 49. 2,34. 3,43) which determines to a large extent the structure of the whole work, corresponds to Panaetius' in De Off. 2,73.

[17] Cf. De Off. 1,69 ff., based on Panaetius' work Peri tu kathekontos, and the discussion of this passage by Pohlenz, Pauly-Wissowa s. v. 'Panaitios,' 435 f.

no room in his philosophy for the pessimism of the Somnium.[18]

If we proceed by way of elimination, Posidonius presents himself as the next likeliest candidate. The influence of this last great encyclopedic mind of paganism is tangible in the works of such different authors as Cicero, Manilius, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, Plutarch, and Philo. Some of the more common themes of the Somnium, and, above all, its mood of pessimism and mystic expectation, could be traced back to Posidonius. But since the Somnium is an organic whole, not a compilation of commonplaces and doxographical notes, it ought to be consistent with Posidonius' doctrine in every detail, except, perhaps, for obvious misunderstandings or mistranslations of Cicero. There is nowhere any direct criticism of Posidonius, but some of his tenets are ignored, some are modified.[19]

The eschatology of the Somnium is characteristic for its relationship to Posidonius.[20] According to both Posidonius and the Somnium, the soul consists of fire and air and thus is able to ascend to the upper regions of the cosmos after leaving the body at the time of physical death. As soon as it reaches the sphere of the moon,[21] it establishes a kind of dynamic equilibrium, because it has penetrated into a substance identical to its own. It has, therefore, according to both Somnium and Tusc. I, reached its natural home (*naturalis sedes*). For Posidonius, however, the soul does not come to a rest in the aetherial region around the

[18] He was, as Pohlenz 433 puts it, "gefühlsmässig . . . reiner Diesseitsmensch."

[19] Both Panaetius (fr. 33 Fowler) and Posidonius (R. M. Jones, Class. Philol. 1923, 211 ff.) maintained that the tropical and arctic zones of the earth are inhabitable; this theory is implicitly rejected, Somn. 16 (cf. Tusc. 1,45. 68 f.).

[20] Both Posidonius and Panaetius denied the immortality of the individual soul; for Panaetius, this deviation from Plato is attested by Cicero, Tusc. 1,79 (cf. Cumont, Lux Perp., 115), for Posidonius by Hermias, In Plat. Phaedr. (ed. Couvreur, 1901) 102, while Somn. 27 f. (= Tusc. 1,53f.) preserves the Platonic tradition.

[21] The Somnium specifies (19) that the milky way is the ultimate destination of the soul, and its natural home; but in a parallel text (Tusc. 1,43), the soul is said to ascend to the sphere of the moon. It is not quite clear whether Cicero, in the Somnium, visualizes the milky way at an infinite distance from the earth (moon and earth appear quite small, the former *ultima a caelo*). There is some evidence, however, that Aristotle and Heraclides of Pontus did not locate the milky way in the sphere of the fixed stars, at the outer limits of the universe, but closer to the earth, at the *confinium* of air and aether (P. Boyancé, Rev. Et. Gr., 1952, 335. M. P. Nilsson, Numen, 1954, 108 f.), and this *confinium*, according to both Tusc. I and Somn., coincides with the lunar sphere.

moon, but starts out from there to a new circular movement back to earth.[22]

To sum up the results we have reached so far: The Somnium represents the point of view of a Hellenistic thinker other than Panaetius and Posidonius, but familiar with the work of both and, above all, anxious to interpret Platonism in "modern" terms. We wonder, whether such an eclectic synthesis of Platonism and Middle Stoicism is conceivable in Cicero's time. We should inquire, in other words, whether Cicero was familiar with a philosopher to whom the various levels and phases of both Platonism and Stoicism had become a unity, because he was willing to sacrifice the subtler points of difference — a philosopher who coördinated the ideals of *theoria* and *praxis* by postulating a metaphysical foundation for the life of action, thus defining the "good life" in terms appealing to any Roman schooled in classical Greek thought.

There is, in Cicero's philosophical writings, an important passage which reads like a summary of the Somnium.[23] In De Fin. 5, 57, man's rôle in life is defined in these terms: *itaque ut quisque optime natus institutusque est, esse omnino nolit in vita, si gerendis negotiis orbatus possit paratissimis vesci voluptatibus.* After this summary of the rejection of Epicureanism which took up the whole of De Fin. II,[24] Cicero continues: *nam aut privatim aliquid gerere malunt aut, qui altiore animo sunt, capessunt rem publicam honoribus imperiisque adipiscendis aut totos se ad studia doctrinae conferunt.* Here, the active life, no matter whether it takes place in the private sphere or in the service of the community, is presented as an alternative to the life of *theoria*. Then, Cicero contrasts both ways of life once more with the *bios apolaustikos* of the Epicureans: *qua in vita tantum abest, ut voluptates consectentur, etiam curas, sollicitudines, vigilias perferunt optimaque parte hominis, quae in nobis divina ducenda est, ingenii et mentis*

[22] On Posidonius' eschatology, reflected in such texts as Sext. Emp., Adv. Math. 9,73. Plut., De Fac. in Orb. Lun., p. 928, see Reinhardt, Pauly-Wissowa s. v. 'Poseidonios' 574.

[23] This correspondence between the main theme of the Somnium and De Fin. 5,57 has been pointed out by L. Edelstein, loc. cit.

[24] De Fin. II follows very closely a text of Antiochus directed against the Epicureans, probably part of the same work on which books IV and V depend (R. Philippson, Pauly-Wissowa 7A, 1939, 1137 ff. Luck, op. cit. 56 f.).

acie fruuntur nec voluptatem requirentes nec fugientes laborem.

In both Somnium and De Fin. V, the statesman and the philosopher are coördinated. In both texts, this coördination is based on two reasons: A. The divine nature of the soul, and B. The worthlessness of a life of pleasure. In the same characteristic manner, both texts arrive from two (by that time) rather commonplace concepts to a startling new conclusion. Following Plato, Aristotle, and the later Stoics, the Somnium asserts that man is not *quem forma ista declarat, sed mens cuiusque, is est quisque* (26) and that man, since the soul is of divine origin, is divine, *deum te igitur scito esse.*[25] That it is man's duty to u s e the best part of himself (*optima parte hominis . . . fruuntur*) is also put forward in the Somnium (29), only more urgently and directly: Scipio's soul will ascend to the heavenly regions, if he puts it to work (*exercere*) in the highest possible activities (*optimis in rebus*). And the Somnium closes with a threat to those who prefer a life of pleasure to either *theoria* or *praxis* which are precisely the two highest possible goals of life according to both Somnium and De Fin. V.[26]

If we now ask whose philosophy the fifth book of De Finibus reflects, the answer is: Antiochus' of Ascalon. Cicero says so himself in several places (De Fin. 5,8. 14. 16. 75. 81).[27] There are few books in the whole of Cicero's philosophical *corpus* whose relationship to a Greek "original" can be more clearly defined. It reflects Antiochus' favorite theory that Academy, Peripatos, and Stoa are essentially the same school, trying to say the same thing, disagreeing only *in verbis*, not *in rebus*.[28] This is certainly

[25] The body is only the vessel of the soul (on this *topos* see F. Husner, Philologus Supp. 17,3, 1924, 77 ff. W. Theiler, Marc Aurel, 1951, 312); the real man is identical with his soul (Plato, Leg. 959B. Arist., NE 1178a7; Stoic testimonies collected by Husner 141. Boyancé, Etudes 124. Theiler 340) and therefore divine.

[26] Those who obey the passions and pleasures of the body will find it very difficult to fly through the universe (Somn. 29). If they have violated the laws of gods and men, they will be imprisoned in the atmosphere of the earth for many centuries (cf. Tusc. 1,27 on the after-life of the undistinguished and on the *topos peri palingenesias* in general see E. Norden on Virg. Aen. 6,733 ff.).

[27] The fact has been established conclusively by Madvig in his annotated edition of Cic. De Fin.[3] (1876) and by R. Hirzel, Unters. 3 (1882) 691 ff.; see Luck 55 ff.

[28] Cic., De Fin. 5,7. 14. Luc., 131. De Leg. 1,53 f. Sext. Emp., Pyrrh. Hyp. 1,235, etc. O. Gigon, Deutsche Lit. Zeit. (1955), 171 has pointed out that this tendency to integrate earlier philosophies is not completely new; it is tangible

the unspoken assumption on which the Somnium is based, an assumption which seemed quite plausible to Cicero at that time (although he abandoned it later), for in his other political treatise, De Legibus, written soon after De Republica, he maintains it personally (De Leg. 1, 53 f.).

Antiochus of Ascalon was the head of the so-called Fifth Academy. He was born around 120 B.C., went to Athens to study at the Academy under Philo of Larissa and became his successor after his teacher's death. It seems probable that at an earlier period of his life, he had come in contact with Stoic philosophers who introduced him to the works of Panaetius. But for a number of years, Antiochus wrote and lectured in the tradition of the New Academy, i.e. he maintained the scepticism of Carneades, Clitomachus, and Philo. Then, suddenly, for reasons we do not know, he radically changed his position from scepticism to dogmaticism, claiming that he had finally revived the old Platonic Academy. This claim he substantiated by asserting that both Aristotle and Zeno had understood Plato better and followed him more closely than Carneades and his successors. Antiochus' philosophical adversaries at once replied that he had always been a Stoic at heart.[29]

Antiochus had experienced this conversion a few years before Cicero came to Athens, in 79 B.C., and heard him lecture in the Ptolemaeum. Several decades later, Cicero recalls Antiochus as *politissimus et acutissimus omnium nostrae memoriae philosophorum* (Luc. 113), a man whom he not only admired as a teacher and thinker, but also, he repeats it time and again, loved as a friend. He mentions Antiochus more than fifty times in his philosophical writings and in his private correspondence. We know from a number of references that a large part of the Academica and of De Finibus reflects the thought of Antiochus. Unfortunately, Cicero is less explicit about the kind of research he did for De Republica,[30] . . . unfortunately, because here, if any-

---

already in Arist., Met. 983b6 ff. De An. 403b24 ff. and in the fragments of Theophrastus' Physikon Doxai. Antiochus, however, carried it to an extreme and based his whole interpretation of Platonism on it.

[29] The testimonies for this tentative reconstruction of Antiochus' biography are collected and discussed by Luck, 13 ff., 73 ff.

[30] N. Wilsing, Aufbau und Quellen von Ciceros Schrift de re publica (Diss.

where, in a work whose scope and title were determined by the great example of Plato's Republic, he had to clarify his own position in regard to the old Academy, i.e. to its official representative Antiochus.

There was an astonishing number of distinguished Roman statesmen among Antiochus' students: Cicero himself, Varro, Lucullus, Brutus, M. Pupius Piso Calpurnianus, all of whom were fascinated and stimulated by his lectures.[31] Since he claimed to be the true interpreter of Plato, it is more than likely that they looked at Plato's political theory — which was certainly not the least of their interests — through the eyes of Antiochus. As the head of the Platonic Academy in Athens, he was no doubt familiar with Plato's dialogues. On the other hand, it is hard to reconcile the doctrine of the dialogues with Antiochus' Platonism. If his eclectic interpretation of Plato's thought appealed so much to Cicero, it could hardly fail to impress a Brutus or a Piso. His bold compromise between Platonic idealism and Stoic rationalism must have satisfied the more practical demands of his Roman students and added to the prestige of the Platonic school in Athens. Antiochus' claim that the Stoa was essentially derived from Platonism took the wind out of the sails of the Stoic competition, and many Roman students who might have been attracted by the Stoa flocked to the Academy instead.

Among all the thinkers who influenced Cicero at one time or another, Antiochus is the only one who could have combined, in the manner of the Somnium, discordant concepts. We have seen that he coördinated the statesman and the philosopher. But the Somnium goes beyond that. It also compromises between the concept that life is death,[32] glory vain,[33] and the earth but a small

---

Leipz., 1929) has presented the evidence. On Pohlenz' theory of Panaetius as chief "source" see above, n. 16.

[31] His relationship to Lucullus was very close. He accompanied Lucullus on a trip to Alexandria, 87/6 B.C., and was later, during the Second Mithridatic War, his constant companion. It is hard to believe that, in such a case, the fascination was purely one-sided. Whoever lives, for so many years, close to a *grand-seigneur* of Lucullus' class, is bound to become a different person (W. Wili, Horaz und die Augusteische Kultur, 1948, 25).

[32] See above n. 1. Following Empedocles and Plato (E. Norden, Jahrb. Philol. Supp., 18, 1892, 330 ff.), the Somnium (17) identifies the underworld with the atmosphere of the earth, cf. Xenocrates fr. 15 H., Cic. Tusc. 1, 92 and in general F. Cumont, Le Symbolisme funéraire des Romains (1942), 124. Lux Perp. 208.

[33] On this concept see Boyancé, Etudes, 147 ff. Cumont, Lux Perp. 135.

island in the universe [34] — and the concept that life is valuable in itself,[35] as far as it is in accordance with virtue, and that glory follows virtue automatically.

Both Plato and the young Aristotle had declared the worthlessness of *ta anthropina*.[36] But in later years (e.g. in the Nicomachean Ethics), Aristotle had become more realistic. Friendship, wealth, a good reputation, he specified, are the necessary ingredients of perfect happiness. If the author of the Somnium had been a strict Platonist, or a strict Stoicist, he would have disregarded Aristotle. Actually, the Somnium takes great care to work in the conciliatory position of the later Aristotle. Glory, it says, is not worthless by definition; on the contrary, we must interpret the desire for glory that stimulates the great statesmen, poets, and philosophers, in the most favorable light. They all think of posterity, therefore implicitly believe in immortality.[37] Moreover, virtue without glory is inconceivable; for glory follows virtue like a shadow. Glory, to be sure, should not be desired for its own sake, but whoever lifts his eyes up to heaven and leads a life of virtue, will find glory at the same time: *quid de te alii loquantur, ipsi videant, sed loquentur tamen* (Somn. 25).

This is a very important point. The Somnium proclaims that both philosopher and statesman, represent the highest ways of life. But how can they be coördinated, when the philosopher, contemplating the universe and comparing its vastness to the smallness of the earth, must come to the conclusion that ambition and glory mean nothing? Whereas the statesman — not the ideal statesman whom Plato had in mind, but Scipio who, although idealized, is nevertheless a real person — needs the assurance that his deeds are known to the world and to posterity? [38]

---

[34] A theme frequent in Post-Aristotelian philosophy, see A. J. Festugière, Eranos 44 (1946), 379 ff. Cumont, Lux Perp. 6 (on Posidonius).

[35] Suicide is forbidden, for the universe, including our earth, is a temple of God (Boyancé, Etudes, 115 ff. Festugière, Révélation, 2,233 ff.), and man fulfills an essential function in this life (Somn. 15).

[36] Plato, Rep. 486. Tht. 173E. Arist., Protr. fr. 10a W.

[37] Another Platonic concept (e.g. Symp. 208C/E), popularized by Cicero in one of his speeches (Pro Arch. 26), see Cumont, Lux Perp., 133 f.

[38] When Scipio has learned to measure the Roman Empire with cosmic standards, he is ashamed of its small size, *ut me imperii nostri . . . paeniteret* (Somn. 16).

According to the Somnium, there is no contradiction. We have seen above that the life of action is actually based on the contemplation of the universe (Somn. 16). We have also seen that this is the position of Antiochus (De Fin. 4,12). Why is it necessary to assure Scipio that glory will be among the rewards of a life of virtue (Somn. 25)? Could this be a qualification due to Cicero himself? But Cicero, as he states himself in Tusc. 5, 21 ff., sees no compromise between the Stoic concept of the *vita beata*, which consists of virtue alone, and the Aristotelian definition which includes a number of necessary ingredients such as wealth, friends, good repute, etc. On this point, he says, he had to disagree with Antiochus who distinguished a *vita beata* (consisting of virtue alone) from a *vita beatissima* (adding to virtue the Aristotelian ingredients).[39] Thus, it is Antiochus' cumulative concept of the *vita beatissima* which underlies the Somnium. Glory is not absolutely necessary for the happy life, but if Scipio has it, he must be called perfectly happy — and he will have it: *sed loquentur tamen*!

I have tried to suggest, in this paper, that the Somnium is eclectic in character without reflecting Cicero's own selective scepticism, nor the uncritical method of a doxographical compilator. Its unity, the equilibrium of its central thoughts, and its method of careful compromise indicate that it is based on the lost work of a Hellenistic philosopher who was thoroughly familiar with the philosophies of the Academy, the Peripatos, and the Stoa. He tried to reconcile them with each other and to endow them with the permanence of a cosmic myth. I have also suggested that this Hellenistic thinker was in all probability Antiochus of Ascalon. The theme of the Somnium — the dignity of man as a creative personality, no matter whether he is creative in the theoretical or the practical sphere — this theme which coördinates the Roman with the Greek ideal of life, seems characteristic for a philosopher whose most enthusiastic students were Roman statesmen.

[39] On Cicero's personal attitude toward glory see U. Knoche, Philologus (1934), 102 ff.

THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPT OF KINGSHIP AS MANIFESTED IN THE LITURGY OF THE WESTERN CHURCH

A Fragment in Suggestion

ALASTAIR GUINAN
New York, New York

Summary Outline

I

Introduction: The basis of the notion of kingship which underlies the Coronation Liturgies of the West. The nature of this liturgical expression: its universality; its varied and even pre-Christian flowerings.

II

The foundation and derivation of the regal authority. Saint Paul and P. Suarez, S.J. The mediaeval concept as interpreted by Lord Bryce. A heritage from the old Roman Empire. Natural Law and moral authority. Liturgists, rather than casuists or canonists, clearer in their testimony. The prayers for the Emperor and the Empire in the modern Roman Liturgy; an interpretation of these prayers justified by what the French liturgists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries wrought in their reformed Service Books.

III

The Sovereign and Society in the thought of those who formed the liturgical tradition. The distinction which obtains between the imperial and kingly offices; changing times and varying shades of emphasis. The common subliminal core.

IV

Old controversies and the issues of the day. The sacramental character of the regal anointing still a matter of some interest. Changes and shifts of opinion in respect to the notion of a sacra-

ment; the concept of sacramentals. The sacred element in the royal office.

V

Monarchy and the modern age. The essence of the monarchical idea essentially opposed to modern perversions of authoritarianism.

VI

The vastness of the subject here suggested for investigation. How aspects of it have been treated by various authors. A plan of approach to the study of the Christian concept of kingship in its liturgical manifestations.

VII

Conclusion: The value of studying a concept noble and elevated, and concerned with a problem rooted in the nature of man.

> "Ecce gravi Rex incessu procedit, et aras
> Suppliciter venerans, regno sua jure pacisci,
> Constantesque animos in religione Piorum
> Annuit, atque humeros oleo dexteramque perunctus
> Accipit oblatum Mystis cingentibus ensem,
> Et sceptri decus, et radiantia tempora circum,
> Imperii specimen, gemmeo diademata textu."
> — Pontificale Romanum; "ad lectorem de recluso Pontificali."

> ". . . to the Church there is and there has always been something sacred in civil authority; and among the things which are Caesar's is a dignity to which it has been her privilege to give a hallowing and a crown."
> — Robert Esmonde Sencourt: The Spanish Crown. (New York, Scribner's, 1931), p. 17.

I

In the mind of anyone who has taken cognizance of the various forms which have, from time to time, been in use at the inaugurations of Christian rulers in the West, and of the charismatic significance with which these forms have been invested, it must

be obvious that underlying the varying rites is a philosophical idea of profound importance. This is a consideration which appeals especially to the historian of faith and opinion in its connection with the teleology of Christianity, with that view which sees the facts and incidents in a given chain of historical development as being — in a fashion often obscure to mortal eyes — related to the end which the Divine Will intends to fulfill by them.

It would be an extreme point of view to claim that the Christian Church is irretrievably wedded to a specific form of political philosophy, for on such questions "high minded Christians notoriously differ, and we have no right to assume that our political friends alone have the mind of Christ." [1] Yet it is true that for the theory of the divine right of kings as assumed by St. Paul, that Church has ever displayed a respect bordering upon veneration. Doctrinal substantiation for the facts observable in the record of the Church's historical attitude towards kings and rulers [2] may be found in the teaching of many doctors from Paul [3] downwards. Although doctrine and political behavior carry much weight here, both are open to certain objections. Is it not rather by the witness of the Christian liturgies, in testimony arresting and important, that substantiation is therefore principally, and best, afforded?

Whatever may be urged against the opinion of the doctors, or against the record of the Church's attitude toward those in authority — that it was here an expression of individualistic enthusiasm or of private opinion unchecked and unsanctioned by the whole body, opinion which must, moreover, be counterbalanced by the contrary *dicta* of other doctors; [4] or that it was there

[1] William Ralph Inge: Vale. (London, Longmans, Green, 1934), p. 34.

[2] Cf. what Dr. Carlyle says of Gregory Magnus and of "the extremely deferential, sometimes almost servile, tone which we find, at least occasionally, in his letters to the Emperors." — R. W. and A. J. A. Carlyle: A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West. (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1903), 1; pp. 153–154.

[3] Cf. Romans, 13. For a compendious statement of the foundation of Paul's theory of the institution of government, see R. W. and A. J. A. Carlyle: op. cit., 1; pp. 89 sqq.

[4] Thus, in contrast to such writers as the Ambrosiaster, St. Optatus, St. Gregory himself, Eusebius of Cesarea, or Cathulfus, or Sedulius Scotus, might be set statements of Rufinus of Aquileia, Hosius of Cordova, or Lucifer of Caligari. In respect to any attempt to erect an *ideal political theory* and to lend countenance to it by

the result of ignoble expediency or of base truckling to great power — it may readily be admitted that considerations drawn from the liturgy are less easily impugned.

In the liturgical expression we recognize, more tellingly perhaps than in any other single and easily observable element in the complexus of religious belief and human life, what best indicates and embodies the characteristic spirit of Christianity. Here speaks the *ecclesia orans*, the praying church; the church, in other words, not as a legalistic institution merely so regarded, nor as a corporation occupied chiefly as such with the excogitation and issuance of dogmatic principle and moral precept, but as the very voice of the Christian community, testifying both to what it has received and to what it summons up from the consciousness of its nature and mission. Here we discern the Church engaged in the work which is the true cause of its existence — the sanctification of the life which is for this time and place, and the drawing of men to a larger life, with Christ, in God.[5] In reading, to-day, the old offices set aside for the hallowing of kings and rulers, it is more than fancy that allows us to hear a voice heavy and mysterious, laden with the accumulated traditions of the race since man first began to work out a system of social life, but a voice fraught also with the joyous message of the New Revelation. From a study of the philosophical and mystical implications inherent in these ritual acts and formularies there may be drawn the outline of a political philosophy which, as well as being marked with the impress of Christianity, has itself profoundly set a recog-

---

citations from *authorities*, especially when we "lift" them from the past, it is well to bear in mind the wise conclusion of Cardinal Alfred Baudrillart in his Quatre Cents Ans de Concordat (Paris, 1904) that we should not here feel ourselves concerned with the application of *geometric* principles. And P. Max Pribilla, S.J., pointedly observes: "Es ist daher scharf zu unterscheiden, was in den Aufstellungen der Theologen für immer verbindliche Lehre der katholischen Kirche und was nur der theoretische Nachklang einer zeitgeschichtlichen Lage ist, von deren Einwirkung sich auch bedeutende Theologen nur mühsam ablösen können; denn auch die Theologen sind Kinder ihrer Zeit." — M. Pribilla: "Dogmatische Intoleranz und bürgerliche Toleranz"; Stimmen der Zeit, 144 (April, 1949), p. 31.

See below, p. 262; and cf. a forthcoming paper by the present writer, "The Holy Church and the Sanctified State: aspects of kingship according to Roman, French, and English Liturgies."

[5] It is interesting to note how important this theme becomes again in the thought of a number of Victorian divines like F. D. Maurice, R. W. Church, and A. P. Stanley.

nizable superscription upon its ethos. The burden of this voice emphasizes, as one might say, the concurrence of natural and supernatural revelation.

The witness of the liturgy in this regard is not the less compelling because of its universal quality. As might be pointed out, what is in substance the same *basic doctrine* of regal authority is postulated by service books used by various Communions and National Churches throughout Christendom. It is true, of course, that in many aspects, this doctrine can be traced further back than to its initial emergence in Christian liturgical tradition, and that it flowered, variously, in pre-Christian times. Here we may bear in mind the well-known remark to St. Augustine that what we call Christianity existed in the world even before the advent of Christ, being represented by those merciful self-revelations which God had granted of himself to the peoples of the ancient world. As Cardinal Newman expressed the same thought, there is a very real sense in which all *natural* religions are *revealed* religions. And, as a matter of fact, in respect to certain notes of identity or sameness which mark Pagan and Christian doctrine on this subject, the words of a modern writer, Mr. Arthur Murray Hocart, are of more than slight pertinence, as when he reminds us of the fascination which the doctrine of divine kingship has ever exerted upon the human mind. Although, as he says, Greece and Rome shook it off in their youth, they returned to it in their latter days; and, as he points out, the supremacy, thus re-won, of the divine kings of this world was surrendered by them only "to another Divine King, a Spiritual King, incarnate once for all in order ever after to rule over the souls of men." [6] Even this change represented only that kind of decline which distinguishes present gods from the Vicars of God; a rather fine distinction, Dr. Hocart thinks, between the incarnate deity and those who are only his representatives. The doctrine of divine kingship appears to be, in its most refined form, an amalgam of man's highest spiritual ideals, wrought together in his striving to set up upon earth a mirror of that perfect state "the type of which," as Socrates said, "is laid up in heaven."

[6] Cf. Arthur M. Hocart: Kingship. (London, Oxford University Press, 1927), pp. 15–16.

While the interpretation of individual facts is always a matter for discussion, the underlying principle or justifying hypothesis in all forms of historic regal inauguration would appear to be such as to suggest the conclusion that it was by its more or less complete apprehension and acceptance that the framers of the Christian liturgies were guided. The nature of the study here suggested requires that attention be directed toward the concept of kingship as expressed by liturgical formularies; but it would, nevertheless, be illuminating to glance briefly at other concepts held not only by secular political theorists but by theologians and ecclesiastics as well; and it may mordantly be noted that the student will find full of interest the manner in which some of these latter have sharply deviated from the theory enshrined in liturgical forms. It has been suggested — although, as I think, not with entire truth — that in France the chief supporters of the sacred character of the monarchy were rather lawyers and jurisconsults than churchmen; while insofar as England is concerned it might be insinuated, in another respect, that the bearing of many legal decisions and opinions, particularly of the fourteenth century, offers considerable ground for investigation.

II

One of the first problems arising in connection with the study of the notion of Christian kingship will concern the basis and derivation of authority. It is here that there must be noted a striking contrast between the older theory, impressed by Paul upon Christianity, and that Suarezian view which has, of late centuries, been considered in some schools of theology as being almost officially sacrosanct. In the Suarezian view, ecclesiastical power comes from Christ directly to the episcopate, while political power is conceived of as coming from God, through the people, to the government. From the viewpoint of the liturgy, however, "all authority" — if we may borrow some trenchant words from the late Fr. George Tyrrell — "all authority, civil and ecclesiastical, comes to rulers and bishops directly from God or from Christ; but from God or Christ as immanent in the community, according

to the teaching of St. Paul and the Gospels." [7] And it may be remembered that when the Pope was generally recognized to be the Vicar of Christ, it was not uncommon to allude to the Emperor as the Vicar of God. Thus, we find Cathulfus, in a letter addressed to Charlemagne, giving counsel to that Sovereign in these terms:

Memor esto ergo semper, rex mi, Dei regis tui cum timore et amore, quod tu es in vice illius super omnia membra ejus custodire et regere, et rationem reddere in die judicii, etiam pro te. Et episcopus est in secundo loco, in vice Christi tantum est.[8]

Lord Bryce, a sensitive interpreter of mediaeval political theory, was concerned to point out that in those times the foundation of Papal and Imperial power was thought of as being identical. In a well-known passage, he instances the assimilation of the Holy Roman Church to the Holy Roman Empire, stressing how Catholicism, the principle of the universal Christian society, is also Romanism and rests upon Rome as its origin and type. He traces the manifestation of the mystic dualism embodied in Christ as divine and human in the status of Pope and Emperor, one the ruler of souls, the other of men's bodies and acts. On what Lord Bryce terms "the older and truer theory," this implied no subordination of one to the other: they were "two servants of the same

[7] George Tyrrell: "From heaven or of men?"; Through Scylla and Charybdis. (London, Longmans, Green, 1907), p. 359. The Rev. Professor Langmead Casserley has lately remarked on "the Anglican tendency to see authority in the Church as sociology sees political authority in the Community." — J. V. Langmead Casserley, in a lecture, "Anglican Theology"; no. 3 in a series, "The Genius of Anglicanism," given at Cathedral House, New York, 18 October 1953. This type of thought may also be discerned in the writings of the mid-nineteenth century American, Orestes Brownson; e.g.: "It is vain in our times to attempt to preserve . . . loyalty to the church by the force of simple external authority, or even by . . . reverence for the prelates whom the Holy Ghost has placed over [the Church]. Both for those within and for those without [the Church], authority must vindicate itself, — must show that it is not merely a positive and arbitrary authority, but that it is authority in the reason and nature of things, intrinsic as well as extrinsic. Minds in our day are to be governed by respecting their freedom, not by restraining it, and men in authority must be more ready to convince than to command." — Orestes Brownson: "Catholic Polemics" (1861); cited by Alvan S. Ryan, ed.: The Brownson Reader. (New York, P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1955); pp. 336–337.

[8] M. G. H. Ep. iv Variorum Carolo Magno regnante Scriptae, 7; apud Carlyle: op. cit.; 1; 215. Cf., also, as a demonstration of the same idea, expressed about three centuries later, the notions analyzed in the able essay of Ernst H. Kantorowicz of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton, under the title "Deus per naturam; Deus per gratiam: a note on mediaeval political theory"; Harvard Theological Review, XLV (October, 1952); pp. 253–277.

King . . . each . . . bound to aid and foster the other." When the Church arrayed the Emperor in its own ecclesiastical vestments, the stole and the dalmatic,[9] just as it had itself assumed the robes and crown of the prince; and when the Emperor sat in person or by representatives in the Councils which debated theological issues — then was this mystic dualism most manifest. Called by Bryce "the one perfect and self-consistent scheme of

[9] This investiture is thus described in the Imperial Coronation Office of the Romanus Ordo de consuetudinibus et observantiis . . . , long ascribed to Pope Honorius III (Cardinal Cencio Savelli): ". . . venit Electus . . . et induunt eum amicti et alba et cingulo, et sic deducunt eum ad dominum Papam in secretarium, ibique facit eum clericum, [hinc Imperatores Sigismundus in Constantia dalmatica indutus, Fridericus tertius Romae stola ornatus, evangelium cantaverunt in missa pontificali], et concedit ei tunicam et dalmaticam, et pluvialem, et mitram, caligas et sandalia, quibus utatur in coronatione sua, et sic indutus stat ante dominum Papam." — Ordo ad Coronandum Imperatorem (E Spicilegio Romano; p. 288); apud Horoy: Med. Aevii Bibl. Patristica. (Paris: Impr. de la Bibliothèque Ecclésiastique, 1879); vol. 1; col. 424. (The passage in square brackets is a note of M. l'Abbé Horoy, the editor.)

On the authorship of this Ordo, cf. the remarks of Edmund Bishop in his Liturgica Historica (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1918); p. 310, where the conclusion is reached, following M. Duchesne (Le Liber Censuum de l'Église Romaine, éd. par P. Fabre et L. Duchesne, in Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, sér. 2, t. 6. [Paris, Albert Fontmoing, 1905–10]; vol. 1; *avis*), that "there is nothing to show that the Ordo in Censius's original manuscript of 1192 (Vat. 8486) was an Ordo compiled by himself"; but that it rather evidences the then current usage of the Roman Court. The inference which will immediately suggest itself is pertinent in regard to the sacred and ecclesiastical character of the anointed Sovereign. In some sense, those who are disposed to exalt that character might well consider that the support which words in this Ordo lend to their position is more weighty than could be the case in respect to a merely private composition of Cardinal Cencio Savelli (Pope Honorius III, 1217; died 1227). Cf. p. 244, infra. In any event, it would seem evident that the Emperor is made a cleric that he may publicly proclaim the Gospel, liturgically as well as in the ordinary discharge of his own sacred office. The importance of the *praedicatio Evangelii* is something of fundamental significance: the liturgical right to engage in it *ratione officii* is a mark of those whom the Christian Church has historically regarded as being, in some special sense, *representatives of Christ*, and hence the public reading of the Gospel has always been thought of as one of the chiefest and most important points in liturgical worship: it has a sense and purpose that is distinctly sacramental. The introduction into the English Rite of Coronation, in the seventeenth century, of *The Tradition of the Bible* to the new Sovereign really harks back then, if it be viewed in the proper light, to very old liturgical ideas. Despite the objection which some modern liturgists, Protestant as well as Catholic, have made to this presentation of the Sacred Book having a place in the service, I am convinced that it is so much in character in its place that it would be a deplorable mistake to abandon it. At the Coronation of H. M. Queen Elizabeth in 1953, an important rôle was assigned to the Moderator of the Presbyterian (i.e. the Established) Church of Scotland at this point in the rite; and the "innovation" cannot but be applauded when justly considered in its proper terms of reference.

the union of Church and State," it is also termed by him "as sublime as it is impracticable," a thing "attained at only a few points in . . . hstory." Yet even when the older theory of this mysterious relationship was supplanted by a view which attempted "to thrust down the imperial power to be the slave instead of the sister of the spiritual," [10] by decreeing a severance of that which actually admits of no separation, "life in the soul and life in the world, life for the future and life in the present"; even then "neither combatant pushed his theory to extremities, since he felt that his adversary's title rested on the same foundation as his own." [11]

As passed the Empire of Pagan Rome, so likewise has old Rome's debtor, that mediaeval Empire which took up so many ancient concepts and wove them enduringly into the fabric of modern European civilization, into that fabric which forms the background, indeed the very warp and woof, of all our Western cultural thought and idealism. Nevertheless, despite the long perduring force of this basic tone and atmosphere, the Christian counterpart of old Rome already begins to loom as a remote and far-off shadow to men of the day, especially to those who ignore their indebtedness to the classical culture. As far back as 1806 that Holy Empire had ceased, in consequence of the act of renunciation made by the Imperial House of Hapsburg, to have juridical existence. Yet may not those who look beneath the surface of things feel themselves in some manner justified to behold in the

[10] An interesting exemplification of this state of mind is provided by a curious old print in the Rhetorica Christiana of Fra Didacus Valades. At the summit of a tree-like plant is seen the figure of the Pope, wearing the tiara and seated upon a throne. On either side of him, but at the ends of slightly lower branches stemming from that atop which he sits, are the cardinals and the patriarchs. Immediately underneath the Pope, at a lower level than cardinals and patriarchs, are two kneeling figures: one, *Imperator;* the other, *Rex.* Inasmuch as archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and other representatives of the spiritual arm are relegated to yet lower positions, it evidently was the intent of the artist to exalt the *curial* (or what an ultramontane would term the *apostolic*), rather than the *spiritual* power, as against imperial and regal authority. Valades is described on the title-page of his book as having been "sometime Procurator General of the Friars Minor of the Regular Observance, at the Roman Curia": he was, therefore in a position to know with some certainty what would be appreciated in that place. See D. Valades: Rhetorica Christiana. (Perugia, apud Petrumiacobum Petrutium, 1579), p. 172.

[11] Cf. James Bryce: The Holy Roman Empire. (New York, Macmillan, 1880), 8th edition; pp. 106–107; 108; 389–390.

modern Popedom more than a shadow of the spirit which animated prototype and counterpart? It is, I think, some such thought which evidently underlies what Dean Inge said of

"the last chapter in the history of the Roman Empire, which perpetuated itself in a marvelous fashion in the institution which it first tried vainly to destroy, and then tried only too successfully to capture. Roman imperialism still survives, the most imposing of all political anachronisms, in the palace of the pontifex maximus on the Vatican." [12]

And a not dissimilar cast of thought is discernible in Cardinal Newman who, as Dr. Walter C. Breitenfeld reminds us, "once made the puzzling statement that 'it is difficult to say whether the Roman Empire is gone or not.' " Newman thought that "much might be said in various ways to show that it might be considered still existing though in a mutilated and decayed state." [13] The Cardinal wrote, of course, about a century ago; but in a suggestive essay published in 1945, Dr. Breitenfeld discussed this "puzzling statement," and concluded that in speaking now of Western civilization we vaguely comprehend "the last secularised and dispirited remnants of that Christian European unity, whose political manifestation the Holy Roman Empire was meant to be"; and that it is thus "that Cardinal Newman may have seen the Empire and its core of immortal truth 'still existing, though in a mutilated and decayed state.' " [14] Dr. Breitenfeld further points out that the strength of the Holy Empire rested in the fact that it actually accepted and took for granted that the code of hierarchical values we call Christian morality is true. The modern Papacy does not present a complete analogue to the perfect union of civil and ecclesiastical power postulated in the old theory of Empire and Church, and it has, as a matter of fact, of late years seemingly renounced that overt activity in political concerns by which it played, in the past, so large a rôle — and not always an ignoble one — in the affairs of Europe. Yet, in its exaltation of the moral code, as it continues ceaselessly ingeminating elements

[12] W. R. Inge: Christian Ethics and Modern Problems. (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1930); p. 144.

[13] W. C. Breitenfeld: "In cujus manu sunt omnium potestates et omnium jura regnorum"; Dublin Review, no. 432 (January 1945), p. 17.

[14] Loc. cit.; p. 24.

and notions basic to our historic Western culture, may we not allow that it does possess some claim to approach, more fully perhaps than does any other institution in the modern world, a position which might well enable the observer to think that hereon has fallen the mantle of the Empire?

During the centuries that saw the cultural dominance of sociological concepts molded in the philosophy developed in the West by the representative minds of the historic Great Church, a type of political theory which recognized the basic importance of the concept of Natural Law so thoroughly colored the spirit and the appearance of European institutions that a modern Cambridge scholar has remarked of the break with the past which occurred in sixteenth century Continental Europe, that among the consequences of Lutheranism was not only "the fideist attitude toward the Bible, of which the Anglican Hooker complained in his Puritan opponents," but a grave endangerment and calling into question of the concept of Natural Law which had been, hitherto, traditional in Europe, and which had involved the belief that by the Rational Process there could be discovered "certain eternal and immutable laws of action and behaviour for human beings," laws indeed existing "quite apart from the Christian and Jewish Revelations (which did not destroy, but supplemented them)." This, as he says, "had been something vital in mediaeval civilisation," acting "as a theoretical bulwark against Despotism" and providing "a standard by which all institutions and acts of authority could be tested." In this atmosphere the creation of Particular Laws could never be "perfectly arbitrary and capricious," and, in the measure that "Natural Law was believed in. . . Sovereignty in the full nineteenth century sense was an impossible concept."[15]

Withal however, and despite widespread agreement in theory in respect to the existence and the vital significance of Natural Law, it would probably have to be acknowledged that not even in the heyday of the classic Middle Age theory of authority was the attempt to achieve a practical and consistently-working synthesis of authority's sacred and secular elements — of which the Carolingian Empire and the Papal Theocracy are two outstanding exam-

[15] H. Outram Evenett: "The Reformation"; Studies in Comparative Religion, ed. by E. C. Messenger. (London, Catholic Truth Society, 1952); no. R127; p. 26.

ples — in every regard successful. Nor was there any long period during which that synthesis was completely and unquestioningly accepted in universal practice. For that matter, and antecedently to any querulous probing into its working, the precise *manner* of the derivation of authority has never gone wholly unchallenged; and Dr. Inge replies to a question about the source of the imperial authority by the remark that "Catholic casuistry has not settled this question, which is not quite the same as the right to disobey an unjust law." [16] Yet, rather than to the *casuists*, be their chosen point of emphasis canonical or moral, it may well be that it is to the *liturgists* we ought go for an answer to this problem. The viewpoint rooted in the liturgy seems to lead quite plainly to the conclusion that ecclesiastical and civil authority are not to be thought of as distinct in foundation or derivation. It is, moreover, not misleading to suggest that in proportion as what may be called *liturgism* has diminished, so has there grown a disposition to think of spiritual and temporal authority as entirely as disparate in their derivation as, by some theorists, they are now often assumed to be in the field of their activity.

The independent churches, for example, where the old principle of liturgism was long held in something akin to abhorrence, have historically shown an inclination to ally themselves with all sorts of anti-monarchical movements, as in Ireland where, in 1789 — as we are acidly assured by the editor of the Correspondence of Lord Cornwallis — "many of the Presbyterian clergy in Belfast ardently promoted these schemes, and some were rash enough to display their hostility to England by praying in their pulpits for the success of the Republican armies." [17] On the other hand, the Church of England, where the tone of life has been so largely regulated by the spirit of the liturgy, has quite consistently exhibited, through the medium of its most representative minds, a thorough-going adherence to the spiritual character of the Crown in the exercise of both civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The same might be said, and perhaps even more emphatically, of the

[16] W. R. Inge: Liberty and Natural Rights; the Herbert Spencer lecture, 1934. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1934), p. 26.

[17] Correspondence of Charles, First Marquis Cornwallis; ed., with notes by Charles Ross, Esq. (London, John Murray, 1859), 2nd ed.; vol. 2, p. 340.

Church of France during a long period of its history, as when under the *ancien régime* and during the Restoration, Altar and Crown were most intimately bound together. It was, indeed, a recognized principle of Canon Law, as understood in France, that the King was so far from being merely a layman as to partake substantially of the quality and *character* proper to an ecclesiastic. It is undoubted, moreover, that the French Sovereign enjoyed many privileges and duties of the ecclesiastical order.[18]

There are many reasons, as it seems to me, for inclining to the conclusion that the view of the matter entertained by those who, at various times, framed the Christian liturgies, was based upon a belief in the Divine Immanence in relation to the Evangelical and Pauline doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ,[19] which caused, in consequence, a quite deep-seated distinction between their view of kingship and that held aforetime in Israel. In ancient Israel, strongly theocratic as it was during the days of the kingdom whose vicissitudes are chronicled in the Old Testament, chief emphasis would seem to have been placed on the Transcendence of God.[20] Given the Incarnation, this could never again be the same; and therefore in Christianity, on the other hand, it would appear from the texts of the various Coronation Rites as well as from other survivals in the formularies of historic worship — as the prayers for the Emperor and the Empire appointed to be said in the Roman Liturgy on Good Friday — that it is the Immanent God expressing his will and spirit through the members of his mystical body who is invoked as the Divine Sovereign *in whose hands lie all powers and rights of kingdoms*. This phrase is from

[18] Cf., for example, Durand de Maillane: Dictionnaire du Droit Canonique et de Pratique Bénéficiale conferé avec les maximes et la jurisprudence de France. (Paris, Bauche, 1761), t. 2; p. 759; s.v. "Souverain."

[19] As a modern Roman Catholic scholar expresses a concept akin to this: "Christian theologians and philosophers, following S. Paul, regard the monarch as God's minister, and hold that the authority of the ruler comes directly from God, even where, as in modern democracies, the subject of that authority is chosen by the people." — E. C. Messenger: "An introduction to Comparative Religion"; Studies in Comparative Religion, ed. by E. C. Messenger. (London, Catholic Truth Society, 1952), no. R101; p. 13.

[20] For a view of Jewish kingship as analyzed from the standpoint of Christian theology, see the interesting and curious old work of Fr. Fortunatus Scacchus: Sacrorum Elaeochrismatôn Myrothecia Tria. (Amsterdam, F. Halma, 1701). I have not seen the recently published work of Professor Johnson; Aubrey R. Johnson: Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel (Cardiff, University of Wales, 1955).

one of the Good Friday Collects which, like the Bidding Prayer which announces it, displays characteristics of prime importance in the present connection:

"Oremus et pro Christianissimo Imperatore nostro N . . . ut Deus et Dominus noster subditas illi faciat omnes barbaras nationes, ad nostram perpetuam pacem. . .

"Omnipotens sempiterne Deus in cujus manu sunt omnium potestates, et omnium jura regnorum: respice ad Romanum benignus Imperium; ut gentes, quae in sua feritate confidunt, potentiae tuae dextera comprimantur. . ." [21]

[21] In respect to these liturgical formularies, see the remarks of Dr. Breitenfeld in his essay already referred to; cf. note 13, supra. Until the present year these prayers (although no longer generally used) stood unchanged in the modern Roman Liturgy for Good Friday. However, the Missale Romanum has now (according to the terms of the "Decretum generale quo liturgicus hebdomadae sanctae Ordo instauratur," 16 Novbr. 1955, of the Roman Congregation of Rites), been superseded, for the two week period extending from Passion Sunday to Easter Day, by the newly revised Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae Instaurata in which these prayers have been modified. Similar action had already been taken by the same Congregation of Rites in respect to the prayer for the Emperor which has, for centuries, been one of the concluding clauses of the *Praeconium Paschale* or *Laus Cerei*, "Exultet jam angelica turba caelorum," sung by the deacon of the Mass during the Holy Saturday service. According to the revised version of that service (the Easter Vigil — first given authorization by the Holy See in 1951, for optative use and now incorporated into the new Ordo, use of which becomes compulsory in 1956), this prayer was modified and made into a prayer in rather general terms for all constituted civil authority, suitable indeed for use under any form of government. In the new text we read: ". . . Respice etiam ad eos qui nos in potestate regunt, et ineffabili pietatis et misericordiae tuae munere, dirige cogitationes eorum ad justitiam et pacem, ut de terrena operositate ad caelestem patriam perveniant cum omni populo tuo. . ." — Ordo Sabbati Sancti quando Vigilia Paschalis instaurata peragitur. (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1951), p. 19. This replaces the older form: ". . . Respice etiam ad devotissimum Imperatorem nostrum N . . . cujus tu, Deus, desiderii vota praenoscens, ineffabili pietatis, et misericordiae tuae munere, tranquillum perpetuae pacis accomoda: et caelestem victoriam cum omni populo suo. . ." — Missale Romanum; Benedictio cerei in Sabbato Sancto.

This traditional form still standing in the pages of the Roman Missal has not quite passed into the limbo of things forgotten, although the imposition of the new Ordo as being of preceptive, rather than of merely optative, use seems to ensure that it shall be no longer used. As a matter of fact, of course, in modern times this clause has very generally been omitted save in the territories of the old Austrian Empire, where it continued in use well into the present century. The *new* clause has this advantage over the older one, that its less exact phraseology admits of its being used anywhere; but, on the other hand, from the viewpoint of the upholders of ancient traditions, it suffers the disadvantage of being a sort of liturgical equivalent to the political attitude of Leo XIII to the Third French Republic, an attitude so deeply resented by many in France during the closing years of the nineteenth century. Under the *ancien régime*, where diocesan variants of the Roman Rite were employed (that of Paris, for instance, remained in use until as recently

There are, in these liturgical formularies dating from about the eighth century, several notable and suggestive indications. To begin with, they serve to emphasize, as Dr. Breitenfeld reminds us, that Church and Empire represent "universal peace and world order . . . emerging at the same historical moment" as "the Good News of 'Peace on earth to men of good will' was proclaimed in Bethlehem and . . . the Pax Romana [was] promulgated in Rome.[22]

This peace and world order were conceived of, in the thought of Christendom, as a discovery and gift of God. We may recall that St. Thomas Aquinas — and he speaks here in the tradition of Cicero, of St. Augustine, and of all the weightier Fathers — reminds us that *fundamental law is nothing less than a participation of the eternal law in a rational creature*.[23] Law so considered is not a mere series of legal enactments, but is the recognition of

---

as 1873), the terms of this clause had been so altered as to refer directly to the King of France. In the Paris Missal published in 1738 (of which there were about fourteen printings in the succeeding one hundred years), we find that this prayer is, as it were, *telescoped* into the preceding clause, with perhaps the intention of emphasizing the spiritual nature of the jurisdiction which, in the thought of the divines and canonists of the old France, properly appertained to the Crown. Thus we read: ". . . Precamur ergo te, Domine, ut nos famulos tuos, omnemque Clerum, et devotissimum populum, una cum beatissimo Papa nostro N . . . et Antistite nostro N . . . necnon et gloriosissimo Rege nostro N . . . quiete temporum concessa, in his paschalibus gaudiis, assidua protectione regere, gubernare, et conservare digneris. . ." — Missale Parisiense. (Paris, A. Le Clere, 1830).

I cite the edition of the Paris Missal published under Msgr. Hyacinthe de Quélen in 1830; it is here in agreement with that originally brought out by Msgr. Ch.-G. de Vintimille du Luc in 1738. At Lyon, the word "gloriosissimo" and the five words between "gaudiis" and "conservare" were omitted (cf. Missale sanctae Lugdunensis ecclesiae [Lyon, A. de la Roche, 1771]). These latter five words are also wanting in the form of the *Praeconium Paschale* used at Fréjus, where the word "Christianissimo," so long associated with the titular style of the Sovereigns of France, is most happily and appropriately substituted for "gloriosissimo" (cf. Missale Forojuliense. [Paris, Cl. Simon, 1786]). And Msgr. Duchesne has noted the existence of other variants of this clause, found in *Exultet* rolls preserved in parts of Italy where the custom, introduced originally from Gallican sources, of thus solemnly blessing the Paschal Candle became so popular that the Popes were obliged, as he says, to permit its usage in "the suburbicarian diocese" as early as the sixth century, although they did not then consent to its adoption in their own church. See L. M. O. Duchesne: Christian Worship: its origin and evolution; tr. by M. L. McClure. (London, S.P.C.K., 5th ed., 1949); p. 252; p. 256; p. 539 Cf. the French original, Origines du culte chrétien. (Paris, Ernest Thorin, 1889), pp. 241–242.

[22] W. C. Breitenfeld: "In cujus manu sunt omnium potestates et omnium jura regnorum"; Dublin Review, no. 432 (January 1945), p. 22.

[23] Cf. his Summa Theologica, la 2dae., q. 91; a. 2.

a positive consonance with *things as they are in their nature*. It is an expression of the Divine Indwelling which finds its outward form in the Holy Empire as the summing up or complexus of what is at once man's recognition of, and testimony to, that truth which God immanent in the Christian community exalts and asserts. In line with this principle, *in cujus manu sunt omnium jura regnorum*, that in God's hands are all rights of rulership, it follows that they, *gentes quae in sua feritate confidunt*, who wilfully and of deliberation set themselves outside the expression of the divinely ordained world order, must be broken by it; hence the prayer: *potentiae tuae dextera comprimantur*. It is through the assertion of this principle, in both positive and negative aspects, that the *barbaras nationes* are made subject to the Emperor who is *dextera tuae potentiae* — the right hand, as it were, of Godly power — being at once the personification and the vindicator of that divine ideal and law to which he is himself subject: *Oremus . . . ut Deus et Dominus noster subditas illi faciat omnes barbaras nationes ad nostram perpetuam pacem*. Here is expressed a sharing by the earthly sovereign in that universal kingship which Christ came into the world to assert, as He himself declared: *Tu dicis, quia Rex sum ego. Ego in hoc natus sum, et ad hoc veni in mundum. . .*[24]

[24] John, 19. M. Albert Camus has beautifully evoked the concept which saw the anointed king as a figure of Our Lord, the true *Christus Domini*, in a moving passage on what he very properly terms the *passion* of the *priest-king*: ". . . Louis XVI semble avoir, parfois, douté de son droit divin, quoi qu'il ait refusé systématiquement tous les projets de loi qui portaient atteinte à sa foi. Mais à partir du moment où il soupçonne ou connaît son sort, il semble s'identifier, son langage le montre, à sa mission divine, pour qu'il soit bien dit que l'attentat contre sa personne vise le roi-christ, l'incarnation divine, et non le chair effrayé de l'homme. Son livret de chevet, au Temple, est l'*Imitation*. La douceur, la perfection que cet homme, de sensibilité pourtant moyenne, apporte à ses derniers moments, ses remarques indifférentes sur tout ce qui est du monde extérieur et pour finir sa brave défaillance sur l'echafaud solitaire, devant ce terrible tambour qui couvrit sa voix, si loin de ce peuple dont il espérait se faire entendre, tout cela laisse imaginer que ce n'est pas Capet qui meurt, mais Louis de droit divin, et avec lui d'une certaine manière, la chrétienté temporelle. Pour mieux affirmer encore ce lien sacré son confesseur le soutient dans sa défaillance en lui rappelant sa 'ressemblance' avec le dieu de douleur. Et Louis XVI alors se reprend, en reprenant le langage de ce dieu: 'Je boirai, dit il, le calice, jusqu'a la lie.' Puis il se laisse aller, frémissant, aux mains ignobles du bourreau." — A. Camus: L'homme revolté. (Paris: Gallimard, 1951); pp. 153–154. It must remain a matter of astonishment to every observer that the Roman Church has not yet canonized this most faithful son and Christian martyr; for the essentially devout and dedicated motivations of Louis XVI cannot

It is in accordance with a similar line of thought that the French liturgiologists of the *ancien régime* were led to apply to the First Vespers of Christmas the following Collect:

"Praesta, misericors Deus, ut ad suscipiendum Filii tui singulare Nativitatis mysterium, et mentes credentium praeparentur, et non credentium corda subdantur. . ." [25]

Notwithstanding the puerile objections which D. Guéranger has made to the use of this collect in this place,[26] the French scholars,

seriously be called into question, any more than reasonable doubt can be entertained that those who encompassed his death were purposively and radically dominated by ideals inherently inimical to Christianity. The compilers of the old Breviary of Versailles appear to have thought the king's canonization to be only a matter of time, for we read in one of the lessons for Matins on the Octave Day of St. Louis IX: ". . . Dum vero solemni apparatu Gallia principibus illis publicos honores persolvit quos Ecclesia inter sanctos retulit, sunt et alii pulrimi quibus aeternam laudem comparavere, sive integerrima vitae innocentia, sive amor in Deum ferventissimus, seu denique infracta in adversis animi fortitudo, aut mira ac pene divina in hostes iniquissimos et crudelissimos caritas. Hos quidem, antequam in beatorum numerum rite adscribantur, solemnibus votis non licet prosequi; at pietatem juvat interea ipsos corde memori recolere, et jam coelo receptos tacita spe ominari." — Lectio vi ad officium nocturnum in Octava S. Ludovici et Festo Sanctorum et Sanctarum e Regia Galliarum Stirpe Principum, apud Breviarium Versaliense . . . pars aestiva, die la Septembris. (Versailles, Angé, 1828); p. 636.

[25] Collect proper to First Vespers of the Feast of Christmas in Breviarium Versaliense, 1828.

[26] The strange notion, expressed by the first Abbot of Solesmes, that the concept evoked by this prayer would make the Infant Savior a *distasteful* figure is but one of the many exaggerated strictures he offers upon the work of the French liturgical reformers of the *ancien régime* throughout the course of that great storehouse of polemical fireworks which he entitled Les Institutions Liturgiques. (Paris-Bruxelles: Société générale de Librairie Catholique; 2ème. éd., 1878–1885). I have endeavored in my forthcoming study of the French liturgical reform of the eighteenth century in its relations to Marian theology (of which an abstract, "Our Lady as intercessor for the departed: a glance at liturgical life in France under the *ancien régime*" has been published in Theological Studies, XV (September 1954); pp. 416–430), to subject certain of these strictures to detailed examination and evaluation along the lines suggested in the pages of the tenth volume of the Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France, wherein the Abbé Henri Brémond has worked out valuable principles of interpretation in respect to the work of the great Latin hymnodists who flourished in seventeenth and eighteenth century France and whose work formed so notable a part of the liturgical renovation of their age. As a matter of fact, even after the time — some seventy years ago — when the last examples of the diocesan liturgies were unfortunately suffered to pass out of use in order to make way for the modern recension of the Curial form of the Latin Rite, specimens of these wondrously beautiful Latin hymns, which M. Brémond cites, have survived in local *propria* appended to the presently authorized Roman liturgy. Cardinal John Henry Newman has paid tribute to these hymns; cf. his Hymni Ecclesiae. (London, Macmillan, 1865); p. xiii. Nor has their influence and use been confined to Roman Catholic circles: a recent work — most unfortunately dis-

in having so appropriated it, demonstrated how thorough-going was their knowledge of liturgical tradition in the true and proper sense of that much misunderstood, and often mis-applied, term. As a matter of fact, this collect so used serves very nicely to extend the thought first suggested in the liturgy of the festival by the collect which is found in the Mass of Christmas Eve. Can it be that to the not very dissimilar ideas therein expressed, D. Guéranger raised no objection because he was influenced by finding them in the Missal he believed most exemplary because he conceived it as being most truly representative of the usages of Urban Rome?

"Deus, qui nos redemptionis nostrae annua exspectatione laetificas; praesta, ut Unigenitum tuum, quem Redemptorem laeti suscipimus, venientem quoque judicem securi videamus, Dominium nostrum Jesum Christum. . ." [27]

III

Christian society, as conceived of after the fashion of thought which underlies such liturgical formularies becomes itself an expression of the divine idea which it, so to speak, incarnates at the same time that it fulfills its own function in the divine law and shares in the divine purpose. The consecrated sovereign is the expression or embodiment, in a supreme sense, of this idea; but the liturgical emphasis upon the doctrine of the membership of all mankind in Christ, in Whom they share a sameness of nature as well as a difference of function, makes it evident that in governing society the sovereign carries out the will of the society which he heads. This emphasis makes it clear that there is not to be ascribed to the framers of the Christian liturgies adherence to the quality of "shiftiness," or moral impermanency, which is apparently inherent in the baser concept of modern majoritarian

---

figured by a mountain of misprints — discusses in very interesting fashion the place which French Office Hymns of the reformed Breviaries play in the Hymnody of the Anglican Church to-day. See Cyril E. Pocknee: The French Diocesan Hymns and their Melodies (London: The Faith Press; New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1954). It is reviewed by the present writer in Theological Studies 17 (June 1956); pp. 266–268.

[27] Missale Romanum; in vigilia Nativitatis Domini, ad Missam: Oratio.

democracy. The ruler, whom the liturgists conceived to be the expression of his people's highest aspirations, the very incarnation of the soul of the nation, deriving his authority to rule from the divine will as expressed through a community cognizant of, and accepting as a norm and rule of conduct, the immutable Moral Law, the ruler is not replaceable by mere numerical superiority of suffrage at periodical intervals, as are the elected officials of a modern republic; for "it is the voice of the people, and not that of the populace, which is the voice of God." [28] Nor did these liturgists think of the energies of the consecrated king, gifted by grace, if, as alas! history attests, not invariably by nature (that nature which grace itself cannot perfect in the face of its own resistance to the divine motions), with special capacities in achieving the ultimate good of those committed to his charge, through his enforcement of that hierarchical scale of values comprised in the fundamental moral law, as being subjected — insofar as matters basic are concerned — to the abnormal sensitivity to changing manifestations of vulgar opinion which necessarily plays so large a part in the mental background of the elective officials of the day. The king interprets as well as leads his people, it is true; but always in consonance with a set of eternal principles constituting an absolute order of life and thought, given and established for ever, a discovery and gift of God, a law which "is not something made by man with an utilitarian purpose, but rather something existing which man may find." [29]

I can readily conceive of facile objection being raised to much of the general line of thought here suggested, on the ground that it confuses — or at least ignores — the distinction between the imperial office and the kingship. There is a truly deep distinction to be made in respect of the character proper to the holder of the office of Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and that of a Christian King. Yet, there is a core — subliminal, no doubt; but perceptible when these ideas are carefully probed — which is common to both. Historically, moreover, as the headship of the Emperor became more vague and shadowy, and as there emerged

[28] George Tyrrell: Through Scylla and Charybdis. (London, Longmans, Green, 1907); p. 359.

[29] W. C. Breitenfeld: art. cit.; p. 19.

more strongly a national rather than an international focus of loyalty, there grew up among men a disposition or temper of mind which found in the kingly, many of the qualities predicated of the imperial, office. Particularly is this true of France, whose kings were the sons of Charlemagne as well as of St. Louis, and whose people, as Lord Bryce did not hesitate to declare, may easily be regarded as "the Romans of the modern world." [30]

The study, herein desiderated, of the distinctively Christian concept of kingship, easily and very properly may preclude any detailed investigation into the manner in which individual rulers have fulfilled the ideal, and this not only because some delimitation of so vast a field is indubitably necessary, but chiefly because it is rather the animating concept than its implementation which is under discussion. Yet the consideration of selected instances may not be entirely undesirable, particularly when it may serve to clarify notions commonly held, to correct them where they seem to be at variance with the truth, and to bring them into closer harmony with it. How Charlemagne and, five centuries later, St. Louis, conceived of imperial and royal prerogative and duty, is better known to-day, and is more correctly represented by many modern writers on historical subjects, than is the notion held of kingship by some sovereigns who are closer to our own day in point of time. When on 3 March 1766, Louis XV informed the Parlement de Paris that in his person alone resided all sovereign power, that he was the chief guardian of the public order, and that his people could not be thought of apart from him, that their interests were necessarily united with his own, and could not rest in other hands than in those of the king, he would seem to have been influenced by a good notion of this concept, however much it be suggested that he may sometimes have failed to exemplify it. Yet, even against a background of such critical reservation, there is reason for believing that his efforts to realize the historic concept of Christian kingship were more serious and more sincere than many modern writers, unduly influenced by principles profanely enunciated by the men of 1789, have been willing to admit. If justice is to be done, there is a balance which must be struck somewhere between the attitude which looks upon all

[30] Cf. note (45), infra.

wielders of power, particularly when they are holders of a sacred office, as *being actually as sacrosanct as they should be*, and the not less banal view which would see all men who are clothed with authority as *being both wholly prone to evil and invariably contemptuous of their sworn duty*. Although one can scarcely disagree with Lord Acton's words to Bishop Creighton in 1887 that ". . . there is no worse heresy than that the office sanctifies the holder of it. That is the point at which the negation of Catholicism and the negation of Liberalism meet and keep high festival, and the end learns to justify the means . . . ," I am not entirely certain that there is not now more rampant an equally *heretical* notion implying that *all* the holders of sacred offices in the past, kings and popes alike, were, *per se* — precisely, that is, because they held such office — *bad*. A fairer and more nicely balanced historical judgment can discern among those who have exercised the *regimen potestatis* among men, more than a few who have been sincerely motivated by devotion to a high ideal, to a concept of rulership which recognized no less than their own exalted station in human society a consequent duty of stewardship as well, a purpose of service, and an obligation to fulfill the maxim of Our Lord when He said: "Quicumque voluerit inter vos major fieri, sit vester minister: sicut Filius hominis non venit ministrari, sed ministrare."[31]

Even a merely cursory survey of the whole question in its larger implications would appear to justify the contention that there is a concept of kingship definitely and characteristically Christian, although it has been influenced by Egyptian, Persian, Hebrew, Hellenistic, and other superficially non-Christian ideas, by the barbarian notion of kingship, and particularly by Christianity's heritage from the older Roman Empire of "the stoic ideal of an enlightened monarchy in which the ruler dedicates his life to the service of his subjects and regards government not as a privilege but as a duty," [32] an ideal which enabled Cicero to make the

[31] Matth. 20.

[32] Christopher Dawson: The Making of Europe. (London, Sheed & Ward, 1932); p. 21. Cf. also the advice of Aristotle to the great Alexander "ut cogitaret imperium sibi contigisse ad benefaciendum toti generi humano." — A. Ales: Omnes disputationes . . . de tota epistola ad Romanos. (s.l., 1553). We find, too, in the admonition addressed to a king before his Sacring according to the rite of the modern Pontificale Romanum, these words: "Et ita te geres, ut non ad tuam, sed

proud boast, "aliae nationes servitutem pati possunt; populi Romani propria est libertas."

In connection with the study of the growth and influence of this concept it would be necessary briefly to survey views of authority held in the Patristic period; for the influence of the Fathers, as well as that of Sacred Scripture, bulked large in the minds of the men who framed the Coronation liturgies. We should also have to consider in their broader philosophical, theological, and sociological aspects certain of the constantly recurring conflicts between representatives of Church and State, and to take some account of the changing relations of civil and ecclesiastical powers in the West. In dealing with the interpretation of the later French Coronation Order, as well as with the ceremonial which marked the inaugurations of members of the Carolingian line, it would be necessary to advert to the theory and view which, in the day of those Princes, regarded the State as "a quasi-religious unity which asserted its sacred character and tended to regard the Church as nothing more than its theological and liturgical organ." [33] Nor in our study of the Coronation in the Papal Mon-

---

totius populi utilitatem regnare." Cf. Pont. Rom.; pars 1a: "De benedictione et coronatione regis."

[33] Christopher Dawson: Mediaeval Religion; the Forwood lectures, 1934. (New York, Sheed & Ward, 1934); p. 18. Cf. also Numa-Denis Fustel de Coulanges: La Monarchie Franque. (Paris: Hachette, 1888); p. 545; p. 558; p. 562. M. Albert Cherel has touched upon the problem of the continuity of the French monarchical tradition in his interesting study of La Pensée de Machiavel en France. (Paris, L'artisan du livre, 1935). Whatever may have been the permutations that tradition underwent, it seems that Dr. Dawson has expressed himself with more than allowable exaggeration when, in writing of "The Tradition of Christian Monarchy," he speaks of the "neo-pagan cultus of the Roi Soleil." After all factors are taken into consideration, is it justifiably to be assumed that the concept exemplified by Louis-le-Grand differs *radically* from that traditional to Western Christendom? See C. Dawson: art. cit.; The Month, n.s.9 [vol. cxcv], (May 1953); pp. 261–266. This same distinguished historian, writing more recently of ideas of the kingship propounded by Bossuet (in this matter an admittedly good exponent of the concept held in honor in his own time) contrasts them with "modern political ideas"; and he remarks that "such conceptions [i.e., those of Bossuet] have more in common with the ancient Oriental and Byzantine ideal of a sacred Monarchy. . ." — C. Dawson: "The European Tradition"; The Catholic World, 179 (May 1954); p. 93. Despite what deprecatory connotations it may convey — whether designedly or not — to modern ears, such a comparison serves, surely, principally to emphasize the estrangement of "modern political ideas" from those inhering in the received Christian tradition; and, value judgments aside, introduces us subtily to the point at which a question may be raised as to which shows the better compatibility with the Gospel and the Liturgy. This is a difficulty I will not attempt here to

archy could we avoid observing the churchly counterpart of this, which made the Popedom in the Roman Church, in Bishop Creighton's words, "the most complete expression of Erastianism . . . not a Church at all, but a State, in its organisation." [34] And, always, it would be incumbent on the student, as Lord Acton expressed it, "to keep in view . . . the movement of ideas, which are not the effect but the cause of public events." [35]

IV

It cannot be otherwise than that our understanding of the varied notions men have held of the kingship will increase as we gain knowledge of the divergent views they have passed upon the problems raised by consideration of the nature and meaning of the Coronation Office, that liturgical rite whereby holders of the kingship have been sacramentally sealed unto their high rôle and function. Its place in history and in theology is not always easy to determine, and we now and again find the commentators giving forth an uncertain sound.

These controversies have not been entirely forgotten, nor can we justly say that they are, even to-day, lacking in pragmatic import. One aspect, at least, has been revived, within living memory, at the time of the recent English Coronations, four of which have taken place in Westminster Abbey during the half century between July 1903 and June 1953.

To the modern secularist it may seem strangely unbelievable to find men disputing upon the sacred character of the kingship, and asking whether or not the ceremonial of Regal Anointing ought to be regarded as being, in any sense, a sacrament of the Christian Church. As M. Marc Bloch — although he does not actually write from exactly that standpoint — has put it: "il est curieux pour l'historien de constater que ces vieilles querelles ont

---

resolve, taking refuge, once again, in the wise apophthegm of the late Dean Inge, already quoted, that "we have no right to assume that our political friends alone have the mind of Christ." Cf. note (1), supra.

[34] Cited by W. R. Inge: Christian Ethics and Modern Problems. (New York; Putnam, 1930); p. 140.

[35] J. E. D. Acton: "Inaugural lecture on the study of history"; Lectures in Modern History; ed. Figgis & Laurence. (London, Macmillan, 1906); p. 3.

encore leur coté actuel!" [36] Yet, insofar as modern England at least is concerned, the matter is not lacking in practical significance in relation to certain theories of church polity, theories intimately connected with the doctrine of the Royal Supremacy, and with considerations paramount in the justification of the special position which the Establishment occupies in respect of historic and institutional Christianity.

The Coronation Office has been compared to the Baptismal Office, and to the Order for the making of a knight; it has been declared to be similar to the Marriage Ceremony, and to the Service incident upon the Consecration of a bishop. Now, all of these rites have in common not only that they exhibit a large degree of external conformity in their general structure, but also that each is the embodiment of a special call to, and the vehicle for the invocation of a special and grace-giving divine blessing to aid the recipient in the following of, a certain specified pattern of life in the Christian Economy. By Baptism men are formally received into the great Christian family; the Order for the making of a knight, which itself bears a rather special relation to the baptismal service, represented in its time the setting apart of a man to a very definite place and function in the scheme of Christian society; marriage is not only a sanctified natural institution, but a type of the union of Christ with His church, and it affords us, in addition, a revealing glimpse of that mysterious belief which sees the whole of the divine creation, sanctified by the Incarnation, as being welded together by faith and by grace to form the Mystical Body of Christ; episcopal ordination represents the conferring of a plenitude of sacred authority and power upon the recipient of it, the giving to him of a commission to express in his official acts the needs and the responses to needs of the community on its spiritual side and the pledge of grace granted to help him worthily to discharge the duties flowing from his commission.

The Regal Unction, as well as marking its recipient for a definite and specified rôle in life, may likewise be considered to repre-

[36] Marc Bloch: Les Rois Thaumaturges: étude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale particulièrement en France et en Angleterre. Publication de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg; fascicule 19. (Strasbourg, Librairie Istra, 1924); p. 187, note 2.

sent the conferring of power, a power both sacred and secular, both spiritual and temporal: it is only in theories of the State which are, historically speaking, of relatively recent origin and development, that the two facets of life are thought of as being quite separate and entirely disjunct.

From the standpoint of ideas radically annexed to the older notion of kingship it would seem that the Coronation Ceremony, apart from its civil significance and its juridical importance as the solemn affirmation of the contract existing between the King and the Nation, is, in some sense not easy to define, one of the forms of Christian Ordination; and as such, that it effectually symbolizes the conferring upon its recipient of both a special character and a special grace-giving blessing, serving as a pledge of capacities granted to him that he may rightly fulfill the office and charge imposed by this character.[37]

St. Augustine seems not to have hesitated to call this function a *sacrament*. Speaking of the veneration shown by David for the sacred person of the king, he writes:

"quaero, si non habebat Saül sacramenti sanctitatem, quid in eo David venerabatur? Si autem habebat innocentiam, quare innocentum persequebatur? Nam eum propter sacrosanctum unctionem et honoravit vivum, et vindicavit occisum; et quia vel panniculum ex ejus veste praecidit, percusso corde trepidavit. Ecce Saül non habebat innocentiam, et tamen habebat sanctitatem, non vitae suae (nam hoc sine innocentia nemo potest), sed sacramenti Dei, quod et in malis hominibus sanctum est." [38]

Augustine's understanding and use of the word "sacramentum" was undoubtedly looser — or wider — than the sense in which later theologians, and notably the Scholastics, took the term.[39] And,

[37] For suggestive analogy, cf. the treatment "de causalitate sacramentorum" of Cardinal Louis Billot in his De Ecclesiae Sacramentis. (Rome, 1924.)

[38] S. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi contra litteras Petiliani Donatistae Cirtensis episcopi libri tres; II; xlviii; apud Migne: Patr. Lat.; xl.

[39] A recent work, which I have not yet found an opportunity to consult carefully, is said to contain "a detailed examination of the meaning of the words *sacramentum* and *mysterium* in the writings of S. Augustine." We are told by Mr. C. F. Kelley in The Downside Review of Autumn 1953, that M. Couturier has indexed all the uses of these terms in the great Doctor's writings, wherein they occur as we are informed no less than 2279 times; and has "classified them according to rite, symbol, or mystery, and tried to point out their underlying

of course, in any case, he here refers directly to the Hebraic anointing. Yet the argument is the same.[40]

Another Christian Father and Doctor, one who will not readily be suspected, I think, of a desire unduly to contribute to the aggrandizement of the royal character, St. Gregory Magnus himself, employed the same sacred term in connection with the same holy rite. In a passage found in his commentary on the first book of Kings, Gregory Magnus says:

"(IReg. x, 1) *Tulit Samuel lenticulum olei et effudit super caput ejus.* Hoc profecto hac unctione exprimitur, quod in sancta Ecclesia nunc etiam materialiter exhibetur: quia qui in culmine ponitur, sacramenta suscipit unctionis. Quia vero ipsa unctio sacramentum est, is qui promovetur, bene foris ungitur, si intus virtute sacramenti roboretur. . . Ungatur ergo caput regis, quia spirituali gratia mens est replenda doctoris." [41]

And it is in the same tradition, that some six hundred years later, the form of Imperial inauguration associated with the name of Pope Honorius III [42] seems to carry the implication that the Coronation of the Emperor is an Ordination Service. Among other things, it quotes during the *Scrutinium* the Apostolic injunction: *Manum cito nemini imposueris.*

Although Lord Bryce maintained that to the older theorists

---

conformity." See C. F. Kelley: review of Études Augustiniennes, par H. Rondet, M. LeLandais, A. Lauras, Ch. Couturier (Paris: Aubier, 1953), in The Downside Review 71 (1953); pp. 425–429. And on the very wide sense in which the term sacrament was used in the fourth century and made to include mysteries of the faith as well, see the illuminating paper by Professor Nock in Mnemosyne, 1952.

[40] Is it a desire to deny — or at least to ignore — this *sameness* which has led certain modern commentators to write as though the Christian *ecclesia* owed nothing to the worship of the ancient Temple or was not, in any sense, serving as the inspired continuator of the Hebraic tradition in the *setting apart* of the personage in the community who occupies so unique a place and discharges so awesome a function as does *the deputy anointed of the Lord*? The mere fact of interruption in the chronology of usage is not sufficiently demonstrative of an opposed origin for each of these solemnities; and it is, no doubt, to go too far along the path of those who are anxious to repudiate entirely the Tridentine claim that the *sacerdotium Veteris Testamenti* was *translatum* into the new Christian Economy — where it appeared as the Catholic priesthood — to think that the anointings of rulers at which *Christian* succeeded as officiants to *Hebrew priests* are absolutely unconnected and disassociated, particularly in view of the plain fact that the doings of the latter were so much read about by the former.

[41] Apud Migne: Patr. Lat. lxxxix; 278.

[42] See note (9), supra.

"the establishment of national churches would have appeared . . . as it must always appear when scrutinized, contradictory to the nature of a religious body, opposed to the genius of Christianity";[43] it was another equally noted English historian, Bishop Stubbs, who did not hesitate to say of the English Church that from the first it was "national in its exclusiveness as well as in its comprehensiveness."[44] Whichever of these opinions be nearer the truth, and nothwithstanding the fact that the dictum of Dr. Stubbs is in close accord with a characteristically Anglican cast of thought — being magnificently expressive of that school of divines somewhat jocosely referred to as Newman tells us in the preface to the French edition of his Apologia, as *the two bottle orthodox*, men who were wont daily so to toast "the King and the Church" — it was nevertheless rather in France (which could look back to the tradition of the Carolingian Empire embodied in the successor of Charlemagne[45] and St. Louis, the eldest son of the Church and Most Christian King, the fact of whose continued communion with the Roman See not even the most unbending ultramontane may disregard), that the union — I had almost said, the *identity* — of Altar and Throne was most trenchantly and proudly stated, as when the French Sovereign was officially informed by his bishops that "you must remember that you participate in our ministry by this sacramental inunction";[46] or, as when in the

[43] James Bryce: op. cit.; p. 39.

[44] Cited by Sir John A. R. Marriott: Dictatorship and Democracy. (Oxford, 1935); p. 74.

[45] Lord Bryce's enthusiasm for Prussia and his antipathy toward Austria have, to-day, a touch of tragi-comedy about them; in any case they crop up repeatedly in his great study of the Holy Empire. Nevertheless, one must wonder if it was mere dislike of the headship of Austria which led him to declare that "there is a sense in which France represents, and has always represented, the imperialist spirit of Rome more truly than those whom the Middle Ages recognized as the legitimate heirs of her name and dominion." (Op. cit.; p. 379.) What he adds of the French, to the effect that "in their political character, whether it be the result of the five centuries of Roman rule in Gaul, or [be] rather due to the original instincts of the Gallic race, there may be found a claim, better founded than any which Napoleon put forward, to be the Romans of the modern world," would seem to indicate some accord with the conclusions of the Abbé Dubos (cf. his Histoire de l'Établissement de la Monarchie. [Paris, Nyon, 1742]), and of M. Fustel de Coulanges, that is to say, with the view which sees the tale of Roman Gaul as narrating not the progress of a conquest, but rather the gradual establishment of institutions deeply representative of the character of both peoples.

[46] See the formulary "Accipe coronam regni" in the French Coronation Order.

person of Charles VII he listened to an archbishop of Reims. Jean Jouvenal des Ursins, declare:

"au regard de vous mon Souverain Seigneur, vous n'êtes pas simplement personne Laye, mais Prélat Ecclésiastique, le premier en votre Royaume qui soit après le Pape, le bras dextre de l'Église"; [47]

or, as each successive king for generations heard his consecrator pray at the Regal Sacring that "this our Prince . . . be given Peter's keys and Paul's doctrine." [48]

Those writers who, like Dr. Gierke and Fr. Thurston think, in the words of the latter, that "the King could never be consecrated an ecclesiastic," [49] those who are shocked or displeased to read of Renan calling the Sacring of a King "presque une huitième sacrement," [50] even those who, like Dom Besse, in calling Renan's expression "heureuse" will hasten to qualify their approval, as he does his, by adding "malgré ce qu'elle a d'exagéré," [51] do not seem, in any large view of the question, to have quite succeeded in definitively and satisfactorily demonstrating that belief in the sacred and ecclesiastical character of the annealed monarch is without foundation. Certainly, Fr. Thurston's gibe that the idea was but *an invention of courtly canonists*, fails utterly to meet the needs of the situation, and is indeed unworthy of so profound a scholar.

M. Bloch, in his fascinating volume having to do with the idea of sacred royalty, a book to which reference has been made above.

— Cérémonial du Sacre des Rois de France. (La Rochelle: Ch. Millon, 1931); p. 81.

[47] Durand de Maillane: op. cit.; tome II; pp. 759–760. Cf. also Charles Dewick: The Coronation Book of Charles V of France. HBS pub. no. xvi. (London, Harrison for the HBS, 1899), col. 85, citing Godefroy's edition of the Archbishop's Histoire de Charles VI. (Paris, 1653), annotations, p. 628.

[48] See the prayer, "Benedic, Domine, quaesumus, hunc Principem nostrum . . ."; Cérémonial du Sacre des Rois de France, cit. sup.; p. 57.

[49] Herbert Thurston, S.J.: "The Coronation": Dublin Review, no. 149 (July 1911); p. 22.

[50] Cérémonial du Sacre des Rois de France. (La Rochelle: Ch. Millon, 1931); préface, p. 10. Cf. "La royauté devenait ainsi une sorte de sacrement imprimant *caractère*, un ordre à part." — E. Renan: Questions contemporains. (Paris: Michel Lévy [1868]; p. 434.

[51] J. M. Besse, O.S.B.: La tradition religieuse et nationale: Église et Monarchie. (Paris, Jouve, 1910), cited in the 1931 edition of the Cérémonial. (La Rochelle, Ch. Millon); préface, pp. 10–11.

speaks of Fr. Thurston as "plaidoyer habile et parfois pénétrant." Without any intention to ignore or even to belittle the very considerable claims to reverence and gratitude which the name of the distinguished English Jesuit must inevitably arouse in scholars, one may yet admit that in this instance Fr. Thurston has been less than "pénétrant," and that one must assent to the further conclusion of M. Bloch that, by being too absolute in his negation of the thesis supporting the sacred nature of the royal character — a thesis strongly defended by Mr. L. G. Wickham Legg, among others — Fr. Thurston reaches a position "plus loin en somme de la verité que l'école adverse." [52] The eleventh century theologian, Cardinal Peter Damian who, in a sermon "de dedicatione ecclesiae," [53] explicitly numbers Regal Unction among the sacraments, cannot in any just account of the matter be thought of as a courtly flatterer in taking so high a view as he did of the kingly character.

Of course, despite St. Peter Damian, despite St. Gregory, despite St. Augustine, there is left much ground for discussion: for one thing, Roman theologians have, for several centuries now, numbered the sacraments at only seven;[54] while the Prayer Book

[52] Marc Bloch: loc. cit. I have here slightly paraphrased his words, while following the sense closely. Recent opinion appears to coincide with what is here suggested. It was not until after I had written this passage, however, that I noted several indications that re-enforce the judgment that Fr. Thurston "had gone somewhat too far" in deprecating the sacred and ecclesiastical character of the kingship. Cf., for example, the essay by D. Cuthbert Smith, O.S.B.: "The Origin and development of the Coronation Liturgy"; The Clergy Review, ns38 (April 1953); pp. 193–202, as well as some remarks by Mr. H. P. R. Finberg in his study of "Changes in the Coronation Office"; The Tablet, London, 201 (9 May 1953); p. 388. In a subsequent issue of the latter journal (13 June 1953; p. 522), Fr. J. H. Crehan, S.J., of Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon., argues in favor of the Thurston thesis; but see the following number (20 June 1953), wherein Mr. Finberg ably defends his criticisms of its underlying ideas.

[53] See St. Peter Damian's text in Migne: Patr. Lat.; cxliv; col. 897c, seq.

[54] Damian thought that there were twelve. M. Adolphe Tanquerey, in his Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae Specialis (Tournai, Desclée, 1914); vol. 2dum. de Sacramentis . . . ed. xiva; pp. 193–197, offers a summary discussion of various opinions concerning their number. Students who have grown accustomed to a certain *rigidity* of approach to this question among modern Roman Catholic writers were no doubt surprised to read in a recent issue of a review published by the Dominicans of the English Province a citation, approvingly drawn, from Père Holstein, S.J., who writes in Études of April, 1954: "It would be to restrain the priestly office if we were to limit it to the simple administration of the sacraments and acts of worship. Since the Middle Ages theological language in making the word 'sacrament' more precise has reserved it for the seven sanctifying acts. . .

Catechism of the English Church defines a sacrament as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us by Christ himself," thus seeming to make the fact of the divine institution a necessary condition of the nature of a sacrament; while the XXVth Article speaks of "two Sacraments of the Gospel" and of "those five commonly called Sacraments." However, the fixing of the number of sacraments at seven or at two is of late occurrence in the history of the Church, and there is in the seemingly forthright terminology of the Prayer Book the revelation of a nature sufficiently imponderable to require careful exposition. We find, for example, that it is stated in the 1938 Report on Christian Doctrine that "Divine appointment may have been effected in various ways, and need not be restricted to explicit institution by Our Lord Himself; it may also be found in the action of the Apostolic Church taken under His authority and guided by His Spirit." [55] It is interesting to note how closely this statement parallels authoritative Roman teaching on this question. Abbé Tanquerey, whose manual is one of those most widely used in Catholic theological schools, declares that it is *of faith* that Our Lord instituted, *at least mediately*, all the Sacraments of the New Law, and that it seems certain that He is also the immediate Institutor of them.[56] Reference should be made in this connection to what is said in a really masterly discussion of the point by the Revd. Norman Powell Williams in respect to the

---

But if we are to give its fulness to the word which was used so generously by St. Augustine to indicate the riches of the christian mystery, where the visible and the human are the way of access to the invisible and of the transmission of grace, we could say that the priests are the ministers of this great and principal 'sacrament' of life which is the Church, the body of Christ." Cf. The Life of the Spirit, VIII (June 1954), p. 579, under the heading "Extracts." In the same connection, reference may also be made to an editorial [by Fr. Conrad Pepler, o.p.] in the same periodical, IX (June 1955); esp. pp. 543–544; and of course considerable light is thrown on the whole question by Professor Nock's article, referred to above, in footnote 39.

[55] Doctrine in the Church of England: the report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922. (New York, The Macmillan Co. [1938]); p. 128. This report is less an authoritative expression of the doctrine of the Church of England than a statement of agreement and disagreement actually existing within the Church; but there does not seem any reason to doubt that the delineation it affords of contemporary Anglican theological thought is a reliable one.

[56] Ad. Tanquerey: op. cit.; p. 198; par. 271.

sense in which the XXVth Article is to be understood, and suggesting that in those "two fundamental sacraments . . . Initiation and the Supper of the Lord" is to be found "the irreducible core or nucleus of the conventional septenary scheme. . ." [57]

Under such aspects of consideration it has appeared logical to some to conclude that the Coronation Liturgy ought not be termed a sacrament in *exactly* the full sense in which that term is used of certain other Ordinances held to be of divine institution. We lack entirely any indication that Our Lord exercised his ministry upon any occasion which might serve as a precedent or foundation for regarding the regal unction as an ordinance of direct divine institution under the New Law; nor does such a solemnity as is the Coronation Office appear to have originated with any of the Apostolic following. However, the fact that when the need for such a liturgical form arose, that need was supplied, may in itself be of some pertinence in regard to notions of *mediate* institution through bishops who, if not exactly of the proximate following of the Apostles may yet be said to have been acting in the spirit of the Church's Founder; while the emphasis which He placed in many of His discourses upon the duty of submission to lawful authority (a theme later developed by St. Paul and St. Peter) would seem to justify the belief that He wished the civil ruler to be regarded as, in some sense at least, possessed of that sacred character which had been considered a mark of the kingship of Saul and David, in the latter of whom especially we recognize the type and figure of every Christian monarch. Those who are disposed to see in the ceremonial observed at the inauguration of Israel's ruler a praefiguration of our Christian ceremonials, find in the origin of the former solemnity a sufficient assurance of divine sanction for the latter. Such appears to have been the opinion of the late Prior of Fort Augustus in Scotland, D. Columba Edmonds, who remarked that "for the unction of the ancient Jewish kings there exists in the Old Testament the authority of a divine command." [58]

[57] N. P. Williams: "The Origins of the Sacraments"; Essays Catholic and Critical by members of the Anglican Communion; ed. by Edward Gordon Selwyn. (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1926); pp. 374–377.

[58] D. Columba Edmonds, O.S.B.: "Coronation Rites"; The Dublin Review, no. 130 (April 1902); p. 243.

And one may find helpful in the present connection the common and useful distinction which the classic post-Tridentine Roman theologians make between *Sacramenta* and *Sacramentalia*.[59] Such a consideration perhaps justifies the conclusion — or at least a tentative statement prior to the careful consideration of all the evidence — that one is, theologically, on perfectly safe ground in clearly calling the Regal Unction a *sacramental*. Nevertheless, reflection induces the thought that this conclusion or statement will leave to those who are disposed to be content with such a partial solution of the difficulty, the only slightly less delicate problem of seeking to excogitate in what manner and to what extent — if, indeed, to any determinable — a sacramental may be thought to convey that *character* or *mark* which is universally agreed to be one of the effects of a sacrament, inasmuch as there are reasons, not lightly to be brushed aside, for maintaining that it has been widely held throughout Christendom that the anointing of a monarch at his Sacring had the effect of really *setting apart* the royal recipient from the rest of men. It would afford an interesting, if somewhat parenthetical, area of enquiry to seek to determine how is the widespread notion of one set apart *by birth* related and connected to the idea of one set apart *by office*, and which is antecedent to the other.

It might, at first blush, be thought that even among those who are ready to accept the sacramental, or at the least, the quasi-sacramental nature of the regal anointing and the existence of some consequent sacred character imprinted upon the annealed monarch, there exists much confusion and disagreement. We find one argument in favor of calling the ecclesiastical character of the ruler a *diaconal* one,[60] another will assert it to be *sacerdotal*,[61]

[59] Cf. Ad. Tanquerey: op. cit.; pp. 182ss and pp. 256–258.

[60] Cf. the fact of the Emperor at his Coronation ministering in the place of the Deacon at the Papal Mass — see note (9), supra; and also Wm. Maskell: Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae. (London, Pickering, 1847); vol. 3; p. xiv, note 25; also Pontificale Romanum (Venice, apud Juntas, 1561); fol. 82. In an old description of the French Rite it is stated: "Et la le Roy fut vestu des draps de l'Église, comme un Diacre." — Froissart, cited by W. H. St. John Hope: "The King's Coronation Ornaments," [part i]; The Ancestor, 1 (April 1902), p. 154.

[61] Of the royal vestments in France the official *Procès-verbal* of later years said: "ces Vêtemens . . . représentent les habits de trois ordres de sous-diacre, de diacre, et de prêtre." — M. C. Leber: Les Cérémonies du Sacre. (Paris: Frémeau, 1825); p. 499.

while a third may be cited in justification of referring to it as *episcopal*.[62]

Yet, it requires no more than slight consideration to show that the confusion is more apparent than real. It is *priestly*, in its wider sense, which is the common term underlying all such attempts at defining the nature of the monarch's sacred character: bishops, we may recall, are but high-priests, and deacons, sub- or assistant-priests. That the nature of the priestly office is two-fold will scarcely be disputed. As it was put by Fr. Tyrrell, in a definition admirable alike for conciseness and comprehensiveness,

> the priest is an official who has received power and authority to teach and govern the religious community and to administer its sacred rites.[63]

In the light of these words it is readily seen that the priestly nature operates in two fields: one is summed up in the word *liturgy*; the other in the term *jurisdiction*, a distinction apparently intended by the wording of the XXXVIIth among the Articles of Religion in the English Prayer Book. Nor can it be doubted that the latter of these two fields is fundamental in practical, work-a-day, import. Although the work of the Church, i.e., drawing men to Christ — or rather, to God, in and through Christ — would ordinarily, and considering the nature of man and the historic doctrine of the Incarnation, be less effectively performed in the absence of liturgical observance, yet the establishment and maintenance of that observance within any given social *milieu*, depend upon the priestly power to legislate.

It is this latter aspect of the priestly character which the

[62] The opinion, common to England and France, which saw in the Coronation vestments an indication of the Sovereign's possession of the three orders of ecclesiastical rank (the *plenitude* of which possession bishops of the Roman Rite, as many liturgists say, indicate to this day by wearing at Solemn Mass the vestments of the three orders imposed one upon an other), expressed itself frequently, as in a description of the Coronation of Henry VI, of whom it was said that after his Sacring, he was "dyspoyld of all his bysshoppes gere." — Cott. MS. Nero C. IX; cited by Arthur Taylor: The Glory of Regality. (London: R. & A. Taylor, 1820); p. 264. Charlemagne was often called "episcopus episcoporum," and while all that is implied by that title seems not to have upset writers of the stripe of D. Guéranger in respect to the great representative of the Carolingian line, their pens seem to quiver in their indignant hands when they consider the suggestion that the same character may appropriately be ascribed, some eight hundred and fifty years later, to his inheritor, Louis-le-Grand.

[63] George Tyrrell: op. cit.; p. 361.

anointed king chiefly bears, and which his office mainly reflects; and it is in this field that the ecclesiastical functioning of the Crown properly operates. For, although liturgical acts of some sort have in the past been attached to the person and office of anointed monarchs,[64] yet neither in extent of effect nor in constancy of practice can such acts of liturgical ministration be compared to that jurisdiction in spiritual matters which, in the thought of those who drew up the varied monuments of the Christian liturgy now extant, and who in their day carried out these rituals, was recognized as rightly appertaining to the Crown.

But the widespread feeling that has given to the monarch a sacred character is based upon profounder depths than suggestive vesture, than the sentiments and writings of learned theologians and venerated saints: a notion of the holy character of authority seems to have been impressed by God in the deepest recesses of the heart of man, and there are, perhaps, but few doctrines that can claim a greater antiquity than can this one. Mr. Hocart points out that "the earliest known religion is a belief in the divinity of kings." This is not to assert it to be "necessarily the most primitive; but in the earliest records known, man appears to us worshipping gods, and their earthly representatives, namely kings." [65] While full investigation of such a point is matter rather for the general cultural anthropologist than for the student who is restricting himself to that branch of science which we term Christian liturgiology, yet even from the more restricted latter viewpoint it may be observed that we who are rooted in the old culture are all — whether we be Catholic or Protestant in our present spiritual allegiance — inheritors not alone of Judaism but, as well, of the amalgam represented by the Graeco-Roman Empire. It is not, therefore, surprising that the antique notion of the identity of Priest and King, manifested in almost every form of

[64] Cf., for example, the ministerial functions alluded to above (note (9) supra), the importance of which has, as I believe, been misunderstood by many recent writers; and the somewhat more spectacular functions of Touching for the King's Evil in France and in England, and the solemn blessing of rings which the Sovereigns of England anciently performed on Good Friday. See Marc Bloch: Les Rois Thaumaturges (Strasbourg, Istra, 1925); and Sir Raymond Crawfurd: The King's Evil. (Oxford, The Clarendon, Press, 1911).

[65] A. M. Hocart: Kingship. (London, Oxford University Press, 1927), p. 7.

Paganism, should be part of our heritage.[66] Nor is there the slightest reason to look askance at this belief, still less to blush at what a materialist might feel tempted to stigmatize to-day as a recreant survival of a Pagan servitude in our Christian culture; for it is, in truth, the acknowledgement of a supernal allegiance, one more elevated than the materialist, in consistency to his principles, can quite comprehend. It implies a belief in man that looks beyond man, to his Source, Home, and Spirit: it inheres in subscription to an absolute code of morals beyond merely State-made law, for it looks upon Law not as something enacted by man for solely utilitarian purposes and subject to change in its basic nature along with changing manners, but rather as a divine establishment, true, immutable, objective, binding upon all creation, being "the ruler and guide," as John of Salisbury put it, "of material things as well as of human beings — subjecting all men to its obedience because all law is, as it were, a discovery and gift of God." [67]

On the other hand, if in respect to the consonance of this high concept with the exercise of earthly kingship, an objection be raised by one who would style himself an advocate on behalf of the *spiritual* (by which some men often mean the *professionally ecclesiastical*) side, he may be reminded that none but the personally self-interested would wish to pretend that there is any more certain guarantee of devotion to duty, of high-minded sincerity of purpose, and of virtue of action, in the clerical than in the regal state.

V

The line of thought here suggested is but one of many which meditation upon the Christian Concept of Kingship will summon up. Other avenues apt for investigation readily reveal themselves; and this is seen to be so despite the fact that some men of the day

[66] When Rome became a Republic, it was necessary to invent an official, the *Rex Sacrorum*, that he although disassociated from political power might perform the priestly functions of sacred kingship; see Nettleship and Sandys: Dictionary of Classical Antiquities; *in verbo*.

[67] John of Salisbury: Policraticus, IV; 2; tr. Dickinson; as cited by W. C. Breitenfeld: art. cit.; p. 19. Cf. also the reference to Aquinas, given in note (23), supra.

might be inclined to bring to the consideration of such a study as that here bespoken the preconceived notion that it is mere antiquarianism, a crotchet of history. To such, indeed, it may be pointed out that kingship is a subject by no means so alien to the modern mind as, by some historians, it was thought to be half-a-century ago, and as it was made to seem, in fact, to many superficial thinkers at the close of the War of 1914–19 when the Great Monarchy which linked Central Europe with its Pagan and Christian roots disappeared in the *democratic mania* of the hour. The increasingly overt manifestation — one of the most striking tendencies of modern society — toward centralization in so many fields of activity offers silent testimony to the contrary. Was it not an awareness of this potent undercurrent in latter-day affairs which moved Mr. Hilary Belloc (who was as truly regarded as a shrewd observer of the contemporary scene as he was felt to be in the front rank of "literary" historians) to the forthright declaration, some twenty years ago, that "To-day all Christendom is hungry for monarchy"? [68]

And at about the same time, the late Dean Inge was pointing out that "the fetish of democracy" had been seen at too close quarters to be any longer worshipped. "It did its work," as he notes, "mainly destructive, in clearing away the relics of feudalism, privilege, and snobbishness; it educated the nation up to a point; but we have had to learn that power in the hands of the many as of the few, is never used well. The history of Europe since the Middle Ages has been a record of emancipation. Kings, priests, independent parliaments, traditional dogmas, and ethical principles have been dethroned one after another; and now a sharp re-action has come." [69]

Nor do the remarks of these two eminent English thinkers, although made a score of years ago, seem lacking in forceful application when considered in conjunction with our present discontents by the man who surveys the happenings of the last few decades, the recent war, the current social unrest, wide-spread dissatisfaction, and well-nigh universal unhappiness and uncertainty,

[68] H. Belloc: Charles the First, King of England. (Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1933); p. 13.

[69] W. R. Inge: Vale. (London, Longmans, Green, 1934); pp. 116–117.

the recrudescence in Asia and Middle Europe of an Oriental barbarism as terrifying as its prototype, the vaguely disturbing and only partially understood threat of a daily approaching era which will stand on the very verge of destruction by reason of its possession of a mysterious weapon of defence, the memory in the Western hemisphere of a kind of personal government which was actually as despotic a thralldom as the old-fashioned Whig historian liked to imagine the régime of the fourteenth Louis to have been. For have we not seen, in our own day, several examples of government variously termed malevolent or beneficent according to the point of view and the allegiance of the commentator, examples of government which embodied all the authoritativeness, the paternalism, and the autocratic implementation of the belief that the individual in supreme power *knows what is best for his people* — all such and similar characteristics usually associated with the "undesirableness" of monarchical government by those who, in text-books or upon the hustings, seek to contend against it and to disparage it? In each of the regimes now adverted to could there not be perceived many of the external marks of kingly government, supported in every case by a strong and undeniably real assurance of consonance with the vulgar will? But — to ask more searchingly — was there not also in each of these only a varying degree of a want of solid adherence to Christian principles, precisely as principles, whatever may be thought of the use made by at least one of them of Christian leaders when the need of the moment counselled lip service to noble pronouncements pragmatically assented to? Of these three examples of personal government, one is gone by violence; one has ceased to function along the lines of determination of its now defunct master; the third remains, and its radical antipathy to the basic principles of our historic Western civilization is only partially apprehended by many earnest and undoubtedly sincere exponents of a larger life among the citizenry of a divided Christendom.

Whatever may be thought diversely, in matters of detail, of these contemporary experiments in personal government, their existence illustrates the fact — clear, at least, to one who takes a long-range view of the life of our Western pattern of cultural thought and aspiration — that there is supreme danger in all at-

tempts to exercise the outward trappings of a venerable institution in ignorance or in contempt of the principles from which that institution draws its life, that is to say, in ignorance or in contempt of those underlying restraints which serve subtly to modify and to moderate excesses. In the modern regimes which have been, as some might think, here somewhat loosely "lumped together," we may recognize many of the "absolutist" and paternalistic notes and tendencies, the physical appurtenances, as it were, of the *concept of kingship*; but in each case these notes are entirely divorced — if it be true in one less openly than in the others — from those notions of abstract justice and of respect for the sacred personality of the individual which are based upon an informing recognition of the existence of Natural Law, notions which permeate the Christian vision of that concept, which give it vitality, which are of the essence of its title-deeds.

It is worth noting, moreover, that recent attempts, in many middle European countries, by which bolshevist groups holding a dominant degree of civil power have illegitimately sought to exercise despotic control over ecclesiastical affairs and institutions, express likewise a deeply seated negation of what is fundamental in a Christian view of the relation of the State to the Church. Those — if such there be among thoughtful men — who affect to see no difference between the efforts of these modern tyrants to subject all things, including venerable manifestations of beliefs which they baldly deny, to their socially destructive schemes, and the attempts made by the Emperors and Kings of past ages to act as vicegerents of God in the disposition of ecclesiastical as well as of civil affairs, are most assuredly skirting the issue.

The consecrated royal figures of the past had actually begun their reigns and assumed their posts of governance with a solemn affirmation of fealty to the Divine Creator and Lawgiver. In every official act, moreover, they proclaimed in formal terms their continuing adhesion to a divinely-given moral order. Cannot such rulers justly be called guardians of Christian civilization, and the states over which they presided bulwarks of that civilization against moral anarchy?

The situation, however, as regards the bolshevists and other totalitarians of the day is quite otherwise than this. Far from

being a genuine friend, the kind of State which these men seek to set up must logically become the declared foe of Christianity. Notwithstanding the fact that such a State may employ, as has been suggested above, some outward and apparent trappings of the monarchical ideal — particularly its mystic claim upon the duty of its people to cherish a deep personal loyalty to the Head of the State — its roots are nourished otherwhere than in the soil upon which anciently flowered the Christian Concept of Kingship. The modern totalitarian state, conceiving of itself as an end in itself, displays an irreconcilable incompatibility to the sovereign claims of the Christian religion with their primary and perduring insistence upon the worth of individuality, upon personal values, and upon the rights and duties of moral persons as drawing their final and only really valid sanction from the Natural Law which man may know by reason. Not merely confessedly totalitarian states, but states wherein the concept of "democracy" has taken on an exaggerated and illegitimate connotation, are increasingly liable to these excesses. As has been justly observed by the Revd. Professor Langmead Casserley:

> It is quite possible for a state not democratically constituted and ordered to respect and even share the conviction of its Christian citizens that their primary loyalty and duty is to God alone. It is equally possible, alas, for a democratic state so to mistake and misinterpret its own nature as to put loyalty to itself above the loyalty of the awakened religious consciousness to the God who makes Himself known to men in the Christian Gospel. Indeed, when democracy interprets itself in a purely secular way this is what tends to happen again and again. Sometimes loyalty to God in and through the life of the Church is even represented as incompatible with the duties of the democratic citizen. This seems to be the main point, for example, of the anti-Catholic writings of Mr. Paul Blanshard. By the adroit strategy of concentrating his fire on the Roman Church, Mr. Blanshard has succeeded in gaining for himself a fair measure of misguided Protestant sympathy, but in reality his point of view calls in question the legitimacy in a democracy of any church or supernatural loyalty whatsoever. He does not really believe that the democratic man ought to entertain and cherish any loyalty higher than his loyalty to the democratic state.[70]

[70] J. V. Langmead Casserley: "Christianity and Democracy"; Cross Currents IV (Fall 1954); pp. 317–318.

Herein, precisely, lies the differentiation I have been striving to express.

Of these — as we may hope — transient recrudescences of anti-Christian forces, it may further be observed that powerful, although latent and intangible things, such as respect for tradition and for long established office which have, in times past, enabled crowned and consecrated rulers successfully to urge a claim to the possession and exercise of sacred and ecclesiastical authority, are entirely wanting in the cases of the sanguinary despots, half-demented racists, and megalomaniac victims of a self-induced messianism, who play so destructive a rôle in latter-day society. All who would view as a disaster for civilization the prospect of their success may take comfort in Dr. Inge's reflection that it becomes less easy to subscribe to belief in the sacred character of the Monarchy when the Sovereign is no longer "a picturesque Stuart, but the absurd William IV, with a head like a pine-apple." [71] Doubtless, the power of physical coercion which the modern despot has at his command makes it easily possible that, from time to time, such will continue grievously to harass the Church; yet in the nature of the case these régimes cannot hope seriously to win even such loyalty as was accorded the Emperor Joseph II by many ecclesiastics of his day. Confronted by these modern adversaries a religious corporation may reflect upon its martyrs and justly feel the significance of Virgil's thought, "O passi graviora! dabit Deus his quoque finem." For in contrast to such incidents in the historic past of Christian Communions as the attempt of Joseph II to reform the Church of his time, the openly materialistic bias, and the evidently *destructive* — as opposed to *reformative* — orientation of the modern dictators is so undisguised from all but the interestedly self-deluded that it appears exceedingly unlikely that these despots will be able, for a period sufficiently long for the full execution of their purposes, to gain within the Church itself an adequate number of adherents to enable them to compromise Christians intellectually as the semi-Arians all but did. It is true of course, that the Sectaries of *La Grande Révolution*, who so adroitly inspired and manipulated the French Constitutional bishops, making of them collaborators of a temper and type of

[71] Inge: op. cit.; p. 12.

thought and action inherently germane to the essential spirit of modern bolshevism, also came very close to forcing Christians to a similar kind of irremediable compromise; but the fact need not be stressed that the Roman Popedom, in even the limited sense in which its Protestant critics will allow it to be considered a center and fulcrum of the historic and continuing revelation of Christian purpose, now occupies a very much stronger position, one more generally respected and hence more immediately effective, than it did under the sixth Pius. Both Pius XI and the reigning Pontiff have, by the use of agencies which could not have been employed in the eighteenth century, set forth the radical issue in too clear-cut a fashion to leave cause for more than passing alarm that any great and considerable body of Christians would now willingly and unquestioningly heed for long those foolish voices who, in our own day, counsel the adoption of a *modus vivendi* by compromise with Communism, and thus join forces with those who seek to suborn a perversion of historic Christianity. I suppose I need scarcely remark that it is not here suggested that the fundamental issue was any more hidden from the Rome of Pius VI than it is to-day. That much misjudged Pontiff, in fact, set it forth very clearly in words condemnatory of the *Constitution civile du clergé*, found in his Brief "Caritas," of 10 March 1791, to the Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld and the Bishops of the National Assembly:

Ex ipsa conventus constitutione facile intelligunt nil aliud ab illa spectari atque agi quam ut aboleretur catholica religio.

Despite, nevertheless, what was then realized in the seat of Western Christendom, there is a contrast of conditions between that time and this making for more wide-spread awareness of the realized peril now than then. For one thing, the progressive centralization — here, for once at least, to be regarded with sympathy by those who give due place to the primacy of human values — the progressive centralization, wonderfully aided by modern advances in means and agencies of communication, which the past century has seen concentrating authority, both actual and persuasive, in the august occupant of the Roman See, as well as the gradual disappearance of the temper of mind which seemed in that

distant day to ensure continuing existence to the cast of thought vaguely referred to as the spirit of Gallicanism, a spirit which, in the event, vanished with the disappearance of the authentic French Monarchy, all this has enormously increased Rome's opportunity of making certain that the truth of her vision of the core of such issues be actual and effective in the most remote quarters of her spiritual dominion, and — what is of more general signification — that it be heard and pondered respectfully even among those whom she regards as *disjecta membra*, those bodies of non-Roman Christians throughout the world who, although they have cast off her overt leadership, would still allow to the ancient central diocese a primacy of honor and persuasion.

VI

The frame of reference into which such a study as is here suggested would have to be set is indeed vast, almost justifying the remark that it would mean writing the history of mankind. There have been treatments of certain aspects of the kingship: histories of the Coronation Office in this or that country, particularly in England, are not difficult to come by; juridical studies of such special points as the nature and meaning of the Oath, a subject which has exercised many a *privat dozent* writing in German, have frequently been made; and various other more or less specialized investigations of particular constituent matters in our subject might be gathered together to form a large and fascinating library.

Not books alone, but many an article of what might unwisely be assumed to be merely ephemeral interest, must be taken into careful consideration in any preliminary survey of the whole field. For example, in a recent essay, which is full of suggestive spurs to thought, the Very Reverend Dr. Joseph Clifford Fenton of the Catholic University of America has directed attention to some radical notions which lie at the base of, and may be drawn from, the formularies of Coronation Rites embodied in the modern Roman Pontifical. That such a paper as Dr. Fenton's must be taken into consideration is true, even though the chief emphasis in the Roman Order of Coronation as this scholar presents it in discussing its survival in the books of that rite as presently authorized,

exhibits some divergence from the points essentially stressed by French and English Coronation Orders in respect to the *character* postulated of the anointed sovereign. For one thing, the French and English forms provide for the anointing of the head, breast, and hands of the ruler, precisely in the spirit of the anointing of bishops and priests, whereas the unction which the Roman Use prescribes is restricted to the princely arm. This restriction may be taken to indicate, as many ecclesiastical commentators — here apparently following the lead of the third Innocent — have not been slow to perceive, that the chief duty of the anointed king is to wield in his strong right arm the sword of defense of the Church, and that he is not in any proper, or even in any allowably indirect, sense to exercise governance over the Church. In particular reference, this is so precisely as to be almost *solely* the point signalled out by Msgr. Fenton in his desire to relate his reading of the theory underlying the Coronation to the recent controversy among Roman Catholic theologians in the United States in respect to the question of the existence of a moral obligation incumbent upon the State to defend true religion and, specifically Christianity in its Roman Catholic manifestation. Nor have other parties to the discussion hesitated to see this as the central point at issue in Dr. Fenton's learned article.[72] So must be understood the carefully documented study by the Rev. Dr. George W. Shea of the Theological Faculty of Darlington in New Jersey, an article which defends, on more strictly philosophical and theological grounds, the thesis which Dr. Fenton educed from liturgical formularies.[73] This is true, likewise, of the opposed point of view set forth, in the midst of an impressive apparatus of citations and references, with what many American readers, particularly among the more theologically progressive and realistic Roman Churchmen of this nation, have felt to be great persuasiveness and clarity, by the Rev. Dr. John Courtney Murray, S.J., of Woodstock College, Maryland, lately Visiting Professor of Philosophy in Yale Uni-

[72] J. C. Fenton: "The relation of the Christian State to the Catholic Church according to the Pontificale Romanum"; American Ecclesiastical Review, 123 (September 1950), pp. 114–118. Cf. also the article from the same hand, "Toleration and the Church-State Controversy"; AER 130 (May 1954); pp. 330–343.

[73] George W. Shea: "Catholic doctrine and the religion of the State"; American Ecclesiastical Review, 123 (September 1950), pp. 161–174.

versity.[74] Another Jesuit writer, P. Max Pribilla of the Society's German Province, seems to surpass even Fr. Murray in what the more rigidly "conservative" theologians have felt to be a somewhat *iconoclastic* attitude toward writers hitherto held in high honor in the Roman schools, by making what these *laudatores temporis acti* seemingly consider an amazingly frank admission that much of the political theory to which their classic theologians appear, at least at first sight, committed, is actually now erroneous, and must be discarded.[75] It may, however, have escaped the attention of some of these critics that P. Pribilla does not actually do more than echo and enforce the dictum of the late Cardinal Alfred Baudrillart of the Académie Française, who in his Quatre cents ans de concordat [76] wisely observed that many judgments of professors of theology, and even many decisions of the teaching authority in the Church, are so conditioned by historical situations that they are of doubtful pertinence in respect to times and circumstances other than those they were constructed to serve. Hence the Cardinal would find himself, as he indicates, out of sympathy with any attempt to apply these judgments and decisions in the manner of geometrical principles. And this is, after all, only a more precise and polite way of saying what Fr. George Tyrrell expressed very well, if a bit harshly, when he declared that the path of the Church's progress is littered with the bleached bones of long forgotten decisions and decrees which in their day were reverenced as immortal.[77]

Nevertheless, valuable as all this may be to the student as he strives to understand the background, the bearing, and the pregnant implications of our subject, it may be conceded that much

[74] J. C. Murray: "The problem of the religion of the State: reply to G. W. Shea"; American Ecclesiastical Review, 124 (May 1951), pp. 327–352.

[75] M. Pribilla: "Dogmatische Intoleranz und bürgerliche Torleranz"; Stimmen der Zeit, 144 (April 1949), pp. 27–40. A translation of P. Pribilla's essay appeared "in slightly adapted form" in a publication of the English Province of the Society of Jesus; see The Month, ns 4 (October 1950), pp. 252–260; and there was published, in an American weekly, a considerable excerpt; see The Commonweal, 53 (17 November 1950); pp. 142–143; both facts being indicative of the wide interest which the expression of the German writer's sentiments has aroused in Catholic circles.

[76] Alfred Baudrillart: Quatre cents ans de Concordat. (Paris, 1904).

[77] Cf., in respect to certain aspects of this current controversy, a brief study by the present writer, already cited: see note (4), supra.

of this scholarly debate has sharper relevance to some controversial issues of the moment than to the writing of what purports to be a contribution to the philosophy of history; and it may be thought that it bears but remote relation to the reproduction, in a more or less objective (while still sympathetic) spirit, of the thought and philosophical leaning of those who made and practised Coronation liturgies.

What is here and, throughout the somewhat discursive paragraphs of the present essay, what has been in contemplation, is rather an effort to effect a synthesis of the whole matter in its historical, philosophical, liturgiological, and sociological implications, such a treatment as will gather together and strive to weave into a single great tapestry the various threads and strands which, over a long and colorful period in human history, have given expression to one or another aspect of the kingship.

One would hesitate, I think, to claim that a book of this description actually exists among any recent publications.

Despite the fact that it offers valuable reflections upon broad aspects of the subject, the recent study by M. le Comte de Pange, Le Roi très Chrétien, [78] is professedly restricted to the high mediaeval period. It certainly will be found indispensable to anyone who wishes to understand the significance of the royal idea in France during that age; but it does not attempt to tell the entire tale. The author — wisely, it may be felt — asserts no pretention to cover all facets of the subject, declaring, indeed, at the very beginning of his book: "Ce livre est né d'une longue méditation sur la problème que pose la mission de Jeanne d'Arc." [79] Valuable as is the Comte de Pange's work in the fulfillment of its projected purpose, it necessarily leaves many problems of the kingship untouched insofar as concerns a more widely ranging attempt to trace and to uncover the numerous ramifications of the subject illustrated by its liturgical manifestations in Western Europe.

The same is true of recent scholarly contributions dealing with other special points of consideration, as for example, Dr. Williams' study of the theory of kingship exposed by The Norman Anony-

[78] Jean de Pange: Le Roi très Chrétien. (Paris, Librairie Arthème Fayard, [1949]).

[79] Ibid.; introduction; p. 7.

mous of 1100,[80] or the most interesting essay suggested by that study which has recently come from the pen of Dr. Kantorowicz, an essay to which reference has been made above.[81]

An attempt is perhaps made to "sum up" diverse aspects of the subject in the studies of Professor Fritz Kern of the University of Bonn, translated by Professor Stanley Bertram Chrimes of Glasgow, as Kingship and Law;[82] but, nothwithstanding the fascinating lucidity of that book and the almost incredible ease with which contrary notions are combined for presentation to the reader, one is left with the feeling that the whole matter is too systematized, if not too simplified, in the arrangement and interpretation given to the facts and opinions surveyed.[83] Furthermore, the emphasis of this German scholar's work is almost entirely in the direction of legal history; while the work of another eminent German writer, Professor Schramm, deals with the English Coronation specifically.[84] Of this last author, Professor Chrimes has remarked (in the introduction to his translation of Dr. Kern's Kingship and Law), that any future comparative study of Coronation Rites will find *an indispensable basis* in the articles cited in his bibliography.

On the other hand, the useful little work of the late Chancellor

[80] George H. Williams: The Norman Anonymous of 1100 A.D.; Harvard Theological Studies, XVIII; issued by the Harvard Theological Review. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1951).

[81] See note (8), supra.

[82] F. Kern: Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages; translated by S. B. Chrimes. (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1939), esp. pp. 55 sq.

[83] It may be that a more careful examination of some of Professor Kern's conclusions would reveal more serious deficiencies. For example, he remarks on p. 56 of the work cited: "The practice mentioned above of appointing the Emperor to an honorary canonry at S. Peter's, actually remained characteristic of late mediaeval Imperial Coronations, but during the twelfth century the declaration: 'Here the pope makes the king a clerk,' vanished from the coronation rite." Now, if we refer not only to the version given by M. Horoy (cited in note (9), supra), but also to the Fabre-Duchesne edition of the Liber Censuum, we will find that the words "ibique facit eum clericum" are most certainly in evidence in the *Ordo* of 1192. This is the *Ordo* associated with the name of Cardinal Cencio Savelli, a holder of high and important offices in the Roman Church under Innocent III; and who himself, in 1217, became pope as Honorius III. I do not readily understand how it can be said of a formulary found in a manuscript drawn up *in gremio Curiae* in 1192, that this formulary had "vanished during the twelfth century." On the *Ordo* itself, cf. note (9), supra.

[84] Percy Ernst Schramm: A history of the English Coronation . . . translated by L. G. Wickham Legg. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937).

of Salisbury, the Rev. Dr. Reginald Maxwell Woolley,[85] does not, to any more fully satisfactory an extent, answer the specifications which are presently in process of being suggested for the pattern of a work on the Christian concept of Kingship as it has revealed itself in the Western Liturgies. For one thing, that book's conclusions are again presented in somewhat too summary a fashion; and notwithstanding the great value of the information and the insights which it provides, it of necessity takes for granted, when it does not entirely ignore, certain lines of enquiry outside the domain of the liturgiologist, if we consider that domain to be circumscribed far more narrowly than is implied by the notion entertained by such a scholar as Edmund Bishop in respect to the scope and range of the scientific study of liturgies.[86]

And, in respect to another kind of restricted consideration, it may be remarked of a recent work of Professor Maritain — I refer to his Man and the State [87] — that it concerns itself solely with "more purely" philosophical aspects of political theory; and in consequence I think that, so far as concerns the present subject of enquiry, its value would seem to lie chiefly in its able presentation of certain background concepts. And much the same judgment, although here emphasizing the matter of historical rather than of philosophical interpretation, must be made of the series of studies edited by the Rev. Professor Moody, under the title of Church and Society.[88] While these studies are particularly concerned with contemporary social and political trends, a suggestion

[85] R. M. Woolley: Coronation Rites, [Cambridge Handbooks of Liturgical Study, no. xvi]. (Cambridge University Press, 1915).

[86] I am thinking, especially, of his oft-repeated assertion of the conviction — which I hold to be profoundly true — that liturgiology is properly rewarding and enduringly valuable only if its study be undertaken jointly with those historical, psychological, and sociological disciplines and habits of thought which raise it from a matter of concern with "mere rubrics" and the organizational detail of ritualism to the vital consideration of aspects of humane activity in devotional life expressive of the richest resources of the individual nature and the social activity of men. Cf., e.g., E. Bishop: Liturgica Historica. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1918); p. ix; p. 123.

[87] Jacques Maritain: Man and the State. The Charles R. Walgreen Foundation Lectures for the study of American Institutions, 1949. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, [1951]).

[88] Joseph N. Moody, ed.: Church and Society; Catholic social and political thought and movements, 1789–1950. (New York, Arts, Inc., 1954).

is thrown out, here and there, which pertains to our subject, if not always in the most sympathetic fashion.

M. Maritain, indeed, does make explicit, if merely passing, reference to the regal anointing. It seems, however, that he does so mainly to serve his purpose of drawing a *distinction* (cf. his pp. 130 sq.) between what he admits was very widely *held* of the sacred character of the holder of the kingship, and what he, himself, believes to be the "sounder" philosophical and theological view. On his own showing of the case, it is clear that these Thomistic opinions and the interpretation of them to which he is attached, are not the *only* ones on the question, regardless of what Professor Maritain may think of the superior validity inhering in them. No one can read the pertinent pages of his book without recalling what Fr. Tyrrell said — writing, however, of Suarez rather than of his precursor, Aquinas — of the differentiating notes between that view of these matters, particularly inasmuch as it respects the question of the derivation of authority, regarded in some quarters as almost "officially sacrosanct," and the view which seems to emerge from the Liturgy.

Even such a book as the fine old work of M. C. Leber,[89] published over a century and a quarter ago, affords only a relatively better example of what is here desiderated. Although restricting himself to the French Coronation Order, M. Leber, especially in the opening section of his book, makes a notable attempt to take a *world view* of the regal inauguration; and his work, even now, abounds in valuable and suggestive ideas. But much research on particular points has been undertaken since 1825, and it ought to be possible for there to be put forth a more comprehensive presentation of the subject in a book of professedly broader purpose than Leber's, in one characterized by a disposition, as well, to take into account the sum of what scholarly investigation during the past century has added to our knowledge of the kingship and what impinges upon it.

The few considerations brought into view in the present essay are alone sufficient to indicate that a deeper knowledge of a belief which has played, as has the Christian concept of kingship, so

[89] M. C. Leber: Des Cérémonies du Sacre. (Paris, Frémeau, 1825).

large a part in the life of mankind during the entire course of recorded human history, and, so far as we can judge, apparently also during ages before written history as we know it began, cannot fail to be of interest and value to us all.

The study of the whole question divides itself quite naturally into several parts: a general survey of the problem might well precede consideration of pre-Christian inaugurations — the rites practised among the Gentiles of the ancient world as well as the Hebrew ceremonials which the Old Testament has recorded for us. A brief historical *aperçu* of the earliest known examples of the solemnity in Christian times would afford a natural preparation for a detailed examination of the Rite is some 'typical' form, as seen in various stages of its development. The forms used for the Emperor,[90] for the Pope, and for kings, according to varying recensions of the Roman Rite might very properly be dealt with under one general heading; this would lead to a study of the French Rite, and to that of the modern English Rite, which owes much to it. The French Rite exemplifies, perhaps, the highest ceremonial and theological development of the ideas and notions underlying this liturgical office; while the English Rite, greatly influenced by it, is of perennial interest in that it seems likely that it may survive the profound changes which the future is felt to hold in store, just as it has weathered successfully the cataclysms of the past. Incidental references would serve to elucidate the position, within the general scheme, of Rites practised in Hungary and in the Scandinavian countries, although indeed, the historic and romantic significance of the Crown of St. Stephen[91] might easily be construed as justifying an extended treatment of the Magyar Rite; and there is, on the other hand, undoubted ground for the opinion that regal inaugurations in Scandinavia

[90] "Remarquons," says M. Millon, "Remarquons que le couronnement des empereurs et le sacre des rois sont des choses absolument distinctes. Il ne faut pas les confondre." — Ch. Millon, p. 6 of his preface to the edition of the French Cérémonial which he published at LaRochelle in 1931. But cf. what has been observed above, at pp. 237–238.

[91] The Rev. Reginald Maxwell Woolley (in his Coronation Rites [Cambridge, 1918], p. 127) has pointed out that at the Coronation of Franz-Josef in the Basilica of Gran in 1867 (for which the Abbé Franz Liszt composed his well-known Krönungs-Messe), the form employed was that of the present Pontificale Romanum, and not that of the Hungarian Rite, which is, in any event, described by Woolley as being "very close to the later Roman rite."

have not generally been invested with the same degree of religious or spiritual significance — certainly not insofar as outward showing may exhibit the presence of these characteristics — as has marked them in other parts of Western Christendom. And, strange as it must seem, some comment of similar sort could be passed on a like aspect of seeming indifference to these characteristics in the tradition of the Spanish kingship.

General conclusions might be set forth in a final summary; while, it would, of course, be of indispensable value to bring under review by the reader the actual texts of those Rites and Uses which had been made the subject of detailed study, and from whose formularies there had been deduced theological and philosophical conclusions.[92]

VII

Not a few thinkers have there been who have sought to discover why the monarchical idea has for so long a time exerted so compelling a fascination over the human mind. ". . . Why is royalty so impressive?" is the question put into the mouth of one of his characters by a sensitive modern writer.

'. . . Why is royalty so impressive?'
'It's the concentration of political energy in a person,' Caithness said thoughtfully, 'the making visible of hierarchic freedom, a presented moment of obedience and rule.' 'I think I prefer the Republic,' Sir Bernard said; 'it's the more abstract dream. But I'm too tired to discuss it. . .'.[93]

The more abstract dream the Republic, indeed; and to some it may thereby show itself so much the less suited to the curiously mixed strains which make up the nature of man. For such observers would see that in monarchy which is not merely a characteristic which might appear *appropriate for our time*, but one, so to speak, *eternal* in that it provides a consistently suitable satisfac-

[92] The very title of this study precludes any pretention to a full consideration of rites employed in the Christian East; but it would be necessary to advert at least to the vexed question as to *how much* and *how directly* Westerners would seem to have been influenced by the Rite of Constantinople.

[93] Charles Williams: Shadows of Ecstasy. (New York, Pellegrini & Cudahy, 1950), pp. 109–110.

tion of a need *inherent* in man. Is it not thus that we should understand what is suggested by the distinguished anthropologist, Dr. Arthur M. Hocart, about "the psychological power of monarchical government?" [94]

Yet, regardless of the good or ill foundation of so broadly rooted and so widely sweeping a claim, enough is known of the Christian concept of Kingship to justify the opinion that a deep and careful study of it seems likely to confirm the conviction that here is, morally, the supreme expression of the monarchical idea. Whether or no such an investigation as that here bespoken dispose us to accept this concept as a political theory wholly consonant with the highest welfare of the race, I do not think that any student who fairly considers the question will deny to the concept an evident nobility, an elevation, and a depth answering in considerable measure to the need of man in seeking a response to one of his ever-recurring problems, a problem rooted in his own nature as an individual and as a social being. Nor, as I think, can this perlustration appear to such a student valueless, if for no other reason than that he is mindful that "a man who does not know what has been thought by those who have gone before him is sure to set an undue value upon his own ideas." [95]

[94] Arthur M. Hocart: op. cit.; pp. 45–46.
[95] Mark Pattison: Memoirs. (London, Macmillan, 1885); p. 78.

LATIN VERSE TRANSLATIONS OF THE PSALMS 1500–1620

JOHANNES A. GAERTNER
LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, EASTON, PENNSYLVANIA

CERTAIN GENERA of animals, once flourishing, but now extinct and known only by their fossilized remains, are described by paleontologists. Literary historians recognize also certain genera of literature, once flourishing, but now extinct and known only to a few specialists who care to delve into books which, gathering dust on library shelves, are all but forgotten and virtually fossilized.

A good example of such a buried and forgotten literary genre is offered by the multitude of metrical Bible translations into Latin that appeared during the 16th century and after a hundred years ceased to exist as abruptly as it had come into being. The great impetus to produce such translations seems to have arisen all over Europe in the late twenties of the 16th century, seems to have reached a climax towards the end of the century and to have subsided during the first decades of the 17th century. Thereafter occasional translations appear, but in the aggregate they have no longer any importance for literary history.

The history of metrical Latin Bible translations is really the history of Psalm paraphrases in Latin verse. It is perhaps not fair to compare our Tables I and III, because in compiling Table I the author could rely upon the excellent study of Hugues Vaganay, Les Traductions du Psautier en Vers Latins au XVIe Siècle (Fribourg 1898; hereafter abbr.: V) which complemented the meagre indications of the British Museum Catalog of Printed Books, while Table III had to rely entirely on BMC, yet it is probable that further research would not change the picture significantly. In the measure that new metrical translations of Biblical books other than the Psalter should be discovered, new metrical translations of the Psalter would also come to light.

The Psalter has always been the most popular of all Biblical

books. BMC lists more editions of the Psalter in its entirety, in selections or in single Psalms (370 columns) than editions of the New Testament, including New Testament selections and separate Gospels (346 columns), and nearly as many editions as those of the entire Bible or selections thereof (394 columns). Beza explained the phenomenon succinctly when he said in the preface to his Psalm translation (verso of sig. a ii in the Geneva edition of 1581) ". . . hoc iis (i.e. psalmis) inest veluti proprium ac peculiare, quòd in caeteris libris nobiscũ loquitur Dominus, in Psalmis verò quid nos vicissim Deo respondere oporteat diuinissimè traditur." Aside from its widespread liturgical use, the Psalter has always been the prayer book *par excellence* for Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. The disparity between the great number of Psalm translations and the small number of translations of other Biblical books reflects only popular preference of the Psalter over other books of the Bible. Aside from popular preference it was, of course, also poetical congruity which made the translators prefer the Psalter (and after the Psalter the Song of Solomon) for their literary exercises. Poetry, it was felt, could and should be expressed by verse translations and much thought was given to metrical problems and formal experimentation. As typical we cite from the preface of an early metrical Psalm translation by Joannes Ganeius (1547):

"Itaque genus aliquod tractandorum psalmorum (quod ad eorum lectionem pios homines inuitaret) meditanti mihi nullum occurrebat commodius, quàm si carmine tractarentur: quòd id genus ui quadam & dicendi gratia allicere lectores soleat. quanquam uerò non ignorabam à tribus ante me in metrorum ordinem ac rationem coactos esse psalmos, Germanis duobus & uno Gallo: non tamen decedendum mihi duxi à proposita semel sententia: quòd qui ante me id oneris aggressi essent, uno eodemq; metri genere psalmos perscripsissent, elegiaco scilicet, quod genus lugubribus primum & miserabilibus querimonijs iuxta uocabuli ἔτυμον accomodatũ est; deinde uerò ad amatoria trãsijt. Lõge diuersissima sunt autẽ in psalmis argumentorum genera: nã alius ἠθικὸς est, formandis moribus aptus: παραινετικὸς alius, qui rectũ uiuẽdi iter sequi moneat: εὐχαριστικὸς alius, εὐκτικὸς alius, alius imprecatorius, & similium generum multa. Itaq; cum iudicarem non omni pedi omnem calceum aptum esse, existimabam quoq; non uno carminis genere tot

tamq; diuersa psalmorum argumenta commode tractari posse: multoq; fore commodius, si uarijs odarum generibus describerentur: unius mihi opinionis auctores fuerunt Iosephus historicus ac Hieronymus, qui psalmos Hebraicos asserunt lyricis esse conscriptos. Ausus itaque sum, deo bene iuuante, in uaria odarum genera psalmos transfundere, quod nemo, opinor, ante me tentauerat." [1]

The titles themselves express this formal preoccupation: "Ode sacra tricolos tetrastrophos . . ." (Table I, 1544), "elegiaco carmine . . ." (1566, 1572), "parodia heroica . . ." (1607), "puris ac perpetuis iambis . . ." (1596), "Latinis hexametris . . ." (1618); most translations, though, seem to be written "vario carminum genere." Towards the end of the 16th century a sort of philological acrobatism produced all kinds of stunts: Joannes Fritscius (1593) manufactured a translation which used at least one hundred different meters, Bersmanus (1594 or 1597) one that used fifty-eight, but even the above-mentioned Ganeius managed as early as 1547 to employ ca. forty different meters for only seventy-five Psalms (V 5). It seems that Bartholomaeus Botta produced a translation both in hexameters and in distichs (1580, V 18), which saw at least two editions (1580 and 1581).

The notion of differing Psalm translations was not alien to the Middle Ages, because multiple translations of the Psalter had been always known; there was the Psalterium Romanum, the Psalterium Gallicanum, the Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos, the Mozarabic Psalter, the Irish Psalter, the Psalter of Milan (Psalterium Ambrosianum) and others. Bibles from the 9th to the 13th century contained sometimes various versions of the Psalter, the Gallicanum e. g. together with the Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos and the Psalterium Romanum. The 8th century already knew a Psalterium Triplex, the 9th century a Psalterium Quadruplex.[2] Ganeius mentions the insufficiencies of the LXX translation: "hebraismos . . . non perspicuè redditos," the "*ἀναπόδοτα* in psalmis frequẽtia," the obscurity of hidden prophecy.[3] All this explains the frequent boast of translation "ex hebraica veritate" in titles

[1] Joannes Ganeius, Psalmi Dauidici, etc., Paris, 1547, author's preface, unnumbered second page.

[2] Arthur Allgeier, Die Überlieferung der alten lateinischen Psalmenübersetzungen und ihre kulturgeschichtliche Bedeutung, Freiburg i. B., 1931, p. 5.

[3] Ganeius, loc. cit.

and prefaces where the translator assures his public not only of a new and more beautiful, but also of a *better* translation than thitherto available.

Though Ganeius and practically everybody else who made these metrical translations pretended to write them for the consolation of troubled souls and mainly for religious reasons (cf. T. I, 1532 "adflictis conscientiis, ac Deum inuocantibus non uulgariter utiles"), the fact remains that the purely religious content of the Psalms could have been gotten equally well from either the Vulgate or any of the vernacular translations which especially towards the end of the 16th century existed in abundance in virtually all European languages. What the educated public found in the Latin (and occasionally Greek) metrical translations was something else: a humanistic delight in literary skill and an occasion for a fascinating comparison between original and translation. The Psalms were well known to everyone through liturgical use, through responsive reading or chanting, through musical versions used in school, church and home, through the prayer books and books of hours; any new version of the old familiar text therefore must have given both Catholics and Protestants the same curious delight we still feel when we hear a parody or the surprise that grips us when we listen to the National Anthem in translation or read it in Basic English. These metrical Psalm versions were extraordinarily effective precisely because the texts that underlay the paraphrases were so very familiar to everyone. A particular "shock of recognition" played its part there.

Since a public which could read Latin verse was necessarily an educated and considerably sophisticated public, an even greater literary delight was found in the comparison between different translations. As early as 1532 a Psalm anthology of several famous Humanists (Melanchthon, Hesse, Moltzer et al.) appeared in Hagenau, which however does not seem to have been a comparative anthology with different versions of the same text; a similar anthology appeared six years later in Toledo. In 1556 Henri Estienne published an anthology wherein poets of four different nations were represented. In fact, it was fairly rare that a publisher entrusted the success of a book to the efforts of

only one translator; frequently enough a Psalm translation was supplemented or augmented by parts of another one or by metrical translations of other Biblical books; even the most famous of all 16th century translations, the one by George Buchanan, did not appear by itself at first in its complete form, but was augmented by some Psalm translations by Theodore Beza (T. I, 1566). Beza's translation itself appeared in a number of editions together with metrical versions of Ecclesiastes and Jonah by Jacobus Latomus (T. III, 1588, 1597) or with the entire Buchanan translation (Morges 1581, Geneva, 1593).[4] Marco Antonio Flaminio's highly successful version was completed by Franciscus Spinula (T. I, 1558) and a paraphrase by Jacobus Latomus Junior was frequently coupled with the fifteen metrical Psalms by Petrus Nannius (T. I, 1558). In 1618 appeared the famous *Duellum Poeticum*, a comparison of paraphrases of the 104th Psalm by Georgius Eglisemmius and George Buchanan, 1696 an Octupla — curiously enough of nine authors — and in 1739 a Decupla of metrical Psalm translations. These latter works however are beyond the reach of our investigation, though we shall return later to the *Duellum Poeticum*. A title like Gregorius Bersmanus' (1594) "Psalmorum Dauidis LXII, post omnes omnium aliorum paraphrasis poetica non contemnenda . . ." shows how aware the author was of literary comparison, and no foreword ever fails to mention, especially after the publication of Buchanan's complete translation in 1566, that in view of so many excellent translations already available the author in publishing his own version was only giving in to the urgent requests of his friends or of persons of high authority. Beza[5] adds that there were also enough bad translations on the market to give him courage enough to publish his own, even after Buchanan's version which he concedes to be superior. He wryly adds "illud quoque Maronis me consolabitur, Æneae magni dextra cadis."[6]

The 16th century showed an extraordinary appetite for Latin

[4] George Buchanan. Glasgow Quatercentenary Studies 1906, Glasgow, 1907, pp. 411 and 414.

[5] Psalmorum Dauidis . . . libri quinque, Geneva, ed. of 1581, preface, sign. a iiii verso.

[6] Ibid., sign. a v.

poetry. Naiden [7] estimates that it produced ca. 200,000 pages of such poetry, and his estimate is conservative and cautious. The printing of some metrical Psalm translations may have been subventioned by the authors — Nicholas le Riche, the publisher of Ganeius' version mentions for instance that the author let the Aldine type in which the book is printed be cut "impẽsis suis" [8] — but in general these metrical translations were published as commercial ventures to make money, if not for the poet, at least for the publisher. This is proved by such a phenomenon as piracy (about which Beza complains in the foreword of his translation, 1579) and by the very many posthumous editions, some of which were even posthumous *first* editions as for instance those of Lampsonius (died 1599, T. I, 1620) and Nannius (died 1557, T. I, 1558). Buchanan might have seen during his lifetime (1506–1582) 16 editions of his translation; 12 more appeared before the century had passed. More than anything else it is, however, the multitude of re-printings that bespeaks the popularity of metrical Psalm translations in Latin; numerous first (and at the same time only) printings would only prove the intellectuals' interest, not popular demand, as in today's lyrical poetry. Not only Buchanan's paraphrase was phenomenally successful, a metrical translation of only 30 Psalms like that of Marco Antonio Flaminio (T. I, 1546) was printed between 1546 and 1576 at least seven times (V 11 and BMC), either separately or amongst other works of the author, appeared five times in an anthology (T. I, 1546) and at least five times more combined with a metrical translation by Franciscus Spinula (Paris 1546, Basel 1548 and 1561, Antwerp 1558 and Cologne 1561 — V 11). The partial and complete translations of the Psalter by Jacobus Latomus Junior, some of them augmented by Peter Nannius' paraphrase of fifteen Psalms, achieved at least six editions between 1533 and 1592 (V 9 and BMC), and even Nannius' contribution appeared in two separate editions (V 13). To judge by extant editions within the author's ken the most popular complete translations of the Psalter seem to have been those of George

[7] James R. Naiden, The *Sphera* of George Buchanan, Doct. Thesis, Columbia University, 1952, p. 3.

[8] Ganeius, loc. cit., verso of title page.

Buchanan, Eobanus Hesse, Theodore Beza, Flaminio-Spinula, and Latomus-Nannius, with Buchanan "facile princeps." Yet such indications have to be taken with caution. The bibliography of neo-Latin literature itself is neither complete nor readily accessible and the tabulations we publish at the end of this chapter give rather what mathematicians call "characteristical samples of a statistical population" than a complete picture of the "population" itself. The author believes he has tabulated at least half of all the writers that published significant Psalm translations in Holland, Switzerland, England, Germany, France and possibly Italy between 1500 and 1620. Vaganay (V 4) mentions the fact that one of his bibliographical sources, J. Albertus Fabricius, Votum Davidicum (Hamburg 1729), enumerates no less than 150 partial or complete translations of which, of course, quite a number belong to the 17th century, while another source, Georg Draudius, Bibliotheca Classica (Frankfurt 1625), cites 46. Vaganay himself intended to publish a Repertorium Latinae Poeseos in six volumes, containing 100,000 pieces of post-Classical poetry, among which he would have published at least 10,000 examples of metrical Psalm translations, which gives a good measure of the importance these translations assumed in 16th century Latin poetry. (V 3.)

Abbreviated titles of first editions have been cited in Table I wherever available, not only because any and every bibliographical contribution in this field is desirable, but also because the titles themselves are interesting. They often reveal the fortuitous occasion that caused or was supposed to have caused the translation. Gregorius Bersmanus paraphrases four Psalms to thank God for the restoration of his friend Joachim Camerarius who had fallen ill (V 16). Stephan Parmenius (T. I, 1582) translates the 104th Psalm to thank God for a successful journey or escape from Hungary to England, Cornelius Crocus publishes his version of the 45th Psalm on the occasion of the Peace of Crespy (T. I, 1544) and Sebastianus Schefferus renders five Psalms "elegiaco carmine" as consolation in time of an epidemic (T. I, 1572). When Jean de Serres, a French Protestant, confides to Buchanan in a letter that he undertook his Greek translation of the Psalms mainly to quiet his mind after the horrors of the Night of St.

Bartholomew,[9] he strikes therewith a note which can not only be detected in titles and prefaces, but also in the choice of Psalms translated. The Penitential Psalms (Ps. 6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143) with their almost desperate pleading and intense hopefulness were a favorite selection, not only because they were so very well known, but also because they seem to have given a particular psychological satisfaction to reader and translator. The classical translation of the century was, after all, if not produced, at least begun by George Buchanan in a Portuguese monastic jail where he was kept during the years 1560 and 1561 by the Inquisition. In an explosive century like the 16th the predilection of the reading public and of the humanists for the Psalter, and especially for the Penitential Psalms, may well have reflected the feeling of uncertainty, the special need for the invocation of divine guidance, the heightened religious fervor which the great schism had produced.

Catholics and Protestants seem to have produced and read metrical versions of the Psalter in Latin (and Greek) with equal delight. Justus Jonas, Melanchthon and Luther addressed enthusiastic letters to Eobanus Hesse when his version of the Psalms appeared in 1537 (V 7). Though the most popular versions were evidently those of Protestants like Beza, Hesse, and Buchanan, we find enough authors that were assuredly Catholic: Ludovicus Crucius was a Jesuit (V 22, T. I, 1586), Bartholomaeus Botta, Prefect of St.-Pantaleon in Pavia (V, 18, T. I. 1580), Angelus de Faggis, Abbot of Monte Cassino (V, 10, T. I, 1540), Hilarius Tadinus, a Cistercian of Milan (V 20, T. I, 1583), Cornelius Musius, Superior of the Monastery of St. Agatha at Delft (V 10, T. I, 1536), to name only a few. Protestants seem to have a slight edge in our tabulation, but that may be due entirely to the fortuitous character of our bibliographical information. Since Protestant printers published as often books by Catholic authors as did Catholic printers those of Protestants, and since a man like Scipio Gentilis, for instance, born in Italy, living in Germany, and publishing in London (1584) proves that intellectual life in the 16th century with Latin as its unifying bond was still international, topographical distribution of printings does not

[9] George Buchanan, loc. cit., p. 410.

mean much. Inspection of Table II shows a general shift of places of publication from South to North, but that probably expresses only the greater prosperity and cultural importance which Holland, Germany, Switzerland, and England achieved during the second half of the 16th century. Again, such a trend may be due entirely to incomplete bibliographical information. What do we know about the Spanish, Danish, Irish, Scandinavian, Polish, or Hungarian neo-Latin poets of that period? [10] Any conclusion as to a confessional distribution among those who produced Latin verse translations of the Psalms would be erroneous. In fact, a contributing agent in the vast popularity of versified Latin Psalm translations may well have been the circumstance that both Catholics and Protestants could enjoy them.

While our first listing thus shows the interest of authors in this literary form, our second listing tries to assess actual popularity as measured in numbers of printings. This listing is to be taken with even greater caution than the list of authors. Not only did the size of these printings vary greatly, but the number of editions comes much less close to the actual picture. Eobanus Hesse's version according to Vaganay (V 6) was published more than 20 times between 1529 and 1600; we could list only 8 editions. Ludovicus Crucius published his version in 1586, perhaps in Rome, and later, 1608, in Lyon; five more editions appeared thereafter in Douai, Madrid, Naples, Milan, and Cologne (V 22), some of which may have appeared before 1620, but none of which we could consider in our tabulation. Yet with all its shortcomings Table II shows clearly the growth of public interest during the last decades of the 16th century and its decrease during the first two decades of the 17th century. The appearance of Psalm selections and single Psalm translations seems to have ceased earlier than that of translations of the entire Psalter.

Table III which, as mentioned above, is least complete, still gives us an inkling of what other texts were chosen for the metrical exercises of 16th century authors. The favorite text is, of course, the Song of Solomon, followed by Ecclesiastes and the very brief book of Jonah. The number of metrical Bible translations outside of the Psalm translations is small, partly be-

[10] Cf. Naiden, loc. cit., p. 3, note 3.

cause the authors preferred to render Biblical themes either in dramatic form (as for instance Buchanan did in Jephthes and Baptistes) or in epical form (as for instance Rhumelius in his Estherais, 1621). Aside from the Liturgical Gospels and Epistles there is little translating of the New Testament in Latin Verse, evidently because the translator was reluctant to tamper with the words of the Lord. It was one thing to garble the words of David or of the Prophets or of the minor writers of the Old Testament, but it was another one to change and to re-interpret words which in a time of fierce religious strife had acquired an extraordinary and even fatal importance. The translation of the New Testament by John Bridges (Sacro-sanctum Novum Testamentum Domini Servatoris nostri IESV CHRISTI, in Hexametros versus ad verbum & genuinum sensum fideliter in Latinam linguam translatum, per Iohannem Episcopum Oxoniensem. LONDINI. Excudebat Valentinus Simsus. CIↃ.IↃ.C IIII.) proves the wisdom of those who confined themselves to the Old Testament. In horribly padded verses Bridges renders the last words of Christ, Matth. 27, 46 with

> Verùm — atenim — verò, nonam *tunc* circiter horam
> Ingenti (dicens) voce exclamauit Iësus,
> Eli, Eli, lama-sábachtháni? *scilicet*, hoc est;
> Mi Deus, *ah*; Deus *ah* mi: Cur me deseruisti?

The author knows all the "tags." He begins his Preface with the words

> In nova fert animus, Divini Oraculi Verbi
> Laeta Evangelij (quod nominis exprimit ortus)
> Foederis (Ecce) Novi, nova, laetaq; nuncia ferre.

Hexameters, unless handled with considerable skill, can easily become monotonous; thus we find the beginning of the Gospel of St. John rendered by Bridges as

> Sermo erat ille in principiô, ille erat atq; apud ipsum
> Sermo Deum, simul ille & erat Sermo Deus ipse.
> Sermo erat hic apud ipse deũ prae tẽpore primô.
> Omnia facta fuêre per hunc, nihil & sine eôdem
> (Quod factum fuit) est effectum. . . . *etc.*

The hymn to charity in I Cor. 13 ends in Bridges' version with the words:

> Porrò, fides, spes, charus amor, remanentia nunc sunt,
> Haec tria: Charus amor, tamen hic *est* maximus horum.

Approximately 24,000 of these wooden hexameters were needed to reproduce the entire New Testament.

When Dr. Johnson [11] said that Buchanan used fewer *centos* than any other modern Latin poet, he praised a virtue that to the 16th century seemed by no means as desirable as it did to later centuries. On the contrary *centos* proved how well read an author was and indeed brought frequently a felicitous perfection into an otherwise pedestrian work. We cite from Joannes Ruxelius' "Britovillani Cadomensis Ivrisconsvlti Oratoris & poetae elegantissimi" paraphrase on the Lamentations of Jeremiah "elegiaco versu redditae" (Rouen 1600) the ending which the King James Version gives as "Turn thou us unto thee, O LORD, and we shall be turned; renew our days as of old. But thou hast utterly rejected us; thou art very wroth against us." (Lamentations 5, 21 f.)

> Postque tot erroris, post tot discrimina rerum,
> In patrio nostro limine siste gradus.
> Da natale solum, natale reuisere coelum,
> Da reduces aris munera ferre tuis.
> Redde tuos patriae, precibus nisi nescia flecti,
> Saeviat aeternùm numinis ira tui.

Contemporaries of the poet found a translation like this with its Virgilian echoes much more acceptable than we do today. At the same time, we observe what liberties an author could take with his text and sometimes wonder that ecclesiastical authorities grew not more excited about these poetical exercises. The theological implications of these metrical translations would make a fascinating study and would show with what freedom both Catholic and Protestant Humanists treated the Bible, a freedom that led to bitter disputes only when the translation was one into a vernacular.

[11] Boswell's Life of Johnson, ed. by G. B. Hill, Vol. II, Oxford, 1934, p. 96.

The most revealing testimony of critical attitudes towards these biblical paraphrases in Latin verse comes from a curious little book Poeticum Duellum seu Georgii Eglisemmii cum Georgio Buchanano pro dignitate Paraphraseos Psalmi CIV. certamen (Edinburgh, 1618) which was published by William Barclay, a noted Scottish physician and writer. George Eglisham, who was a friend of Barclay and a quarrelsome Scot with an extraordinary talent for making enemies had, it seems, previously published a little pamphlet wherein he had compared his own translation of the 104th Psalm with that of Buchanan (to the detriment of the latter) and had submitted both versions together with his commentary to the University of Paris for critical judgment and decision. The University seems to have avoided any decision, but Barclay felt called upon to defend publicly the superiority of Buchanan's version. (As did Arthur Johnston in a pamphlet Consilium de mania G. Eglishemii which appeared in 1619 in Edinburgh and Paris.) [12] It is interesting to note that Barclay thinks it positively meritorious to use *centos*, thus he freely acknowledges Buchanan's borrowings from Virgil and Lucretius [13] and even goes so far as to remark apropos of the verses by Buchanan

Inque vicem subeunt hominumque boumque labores,
Donec sera rubens accendat lumina vesper.

"Artificii est fundere Virgilii versus tamquam suos." [14]

Eglisham translates the same verses with

Redeunt alacres ad plaustra coloni,
Donec purpureus det sera crepuscula vesper.

But Barclay finds:

"Multa erant longè honestiora opera, quibus exprimeretur sententia Prophetae; qui non nominatim, sed generatim, producit hominem *ad opus*, tu *plaustrarium* facis. Non paulò civilius *Buchananus opus* vertit *labores*. Ne objicias *culturam*, aio, *culturam* comprehendere plurima mundiore *plaustro*. Virg. docet in Georg. Miror cur non sumpseris

[12] Leicester Bradner, Musae Anglicanae, New York, 1940, pp. 354 & 182.

[13] Barclay, Poeticum Duellum . . . etc., in Poetarum Scotorum Musae Sacrae, ed. by Gulielmus Lauderus, Edinburgh, 1740, p. 20 f.

[14] Ibid., p. 28.

Virg. versum, quem poteras eodem jure, quo ille, nisi crederes te meliorem facturum." [15]

Literary theft as a form of modesty!

Eglisham bases his deprecatory criticism of Buchanan's version on ten points which will be cited together with Barclay's rebuttal.

1. Buchanan, says Eglisham, uses a false quantity by shortening the third syllable of *denuo*, which is derived from *de novo*. Barclay cites Victorinus and Sedulius both of whom have considered the word a dactyl, and alleges that *sedulo*, *mutuo*, *cito* have a short ultima and are also derived from substantives. If Eglisham were consistent, he ought to lengthen the first syllable of *quoad* too. Barclay is walking on very thin ice here.

2. In Buchanan's verses

> Neve iterum immissa tellus stagnaret ab unda,
> Limitibus compressa suis resonantia plangit
> Littora, praescriptas metuens transcendere metas.

Eglisham finds a solecism in *compressa* if it refers to *unda,* a nominative referring to an ablative, and a logical impossibility if it refers to *tellus*. Barclay defends the nominative of *compressa* on Linacer's authority as a "syllepsis casûs," which syllepsis is "cum dissimilibus clausulis commune aliquid, quod in una ponitur mutatum aliquatenus, in alia desideraretur." [16] He then cites some pertinent passages from classical authors. *Unda* would be the word common to both clauses. Eglisham is of course right and Linacer's "rule" is one of those lame attempts of grammarians to make the slips of classical authors acceptable.

3. Eglisham finds a number of Buchanan's verses too much like prose, e.g.

> At verò impietas planè exstirpetur ab ima
> Radice, & scelerum stirps nulla repullulet, ac nos

which Barclay counters by reminding Eglisham that complication does not make good verses either. More important, however, is Eglisham's attack against the frequent occurrence of inner rhymes in Buchanan's verses, of which he cites fifteen examples, e.g. "Praedator vacuis errare leunculus arvis," and which he calls leonine rhymes, on the order of "Ni fallat fatum, Scoti quocumque loca-

[15] Ibid., p. 28.
[16] Ibid., p. 43.

tum." As in all his rejoinders Barclay cites classical precedents, in this case for instance Ovid's "Quot Coelum stellas, tot habet tua Roma puellas," which indeed would be a leonine hexameter. Yet Barclay observes rightly that the verses Eglisham objects to are rather homoeoteleuta, because in the leonine rhyme the last two syllables of the rhyming words coincide (fatum — locatum), while in Buchanan's verses only the last syllables rhyme (vacuis — arvis), a practice for which innumerable classical verses can be cited. If the rule that assonances are to be avoided in quantitative poetry is strictly enforced, Eglisham is right. On the other hand, the classical poets seem to have been less cramped by rules than their later imitators.

4. Eglisham objects against an excessive use of connective particles like, *et*, *atque*, *que*, *ac* of which he cites 34 examples. Barclay finds not only that Virgil is equally lavish in their use, but that they might even adorn a verse without being strictly necessary. Eglisham's point is not badly taken, because these particles often are used by the neo-Latin poets as simple expedients to make up a correct meter.

5. Eglisham cites as objectionable 35 elisions, among which those that fall on the fifth foot are especially bad (2 examples). Barclay finds that elisions enhance the grandeur of the poem and are really ornaments of verse, which is, of course, nonsense. He quotes triumphantly Phyllida amo ante alias — "ubi quatuor verba, tres elisiones" which only proves that ancient poets also slept at times.

6. "Sextò, congessit omnia supplementa miserè laborantis ingenii, . . ." says Eglisham, namely innumerable repetitions and the use of many possibly emphatic, but certainly superfluous, words (for instance, *te Patrem*, *à te uno*, *te magnum*, *te rursus vultum*, *te tollente*, etc.). Barclay answers that in ten verses of Homer there are more repetitions and fill words than in sixty verses of Buchanan. They are "signa acerrimi judicii, periti artificis, & indicia perfectissimae orationis." Architects need mortar and cement for their buildings, likewise the poet. Wordiness is the curse of neo-Latin poetry and there is no doubt that Eglisham's criticism was more than justified, if not applied to Buchanan's poems, very much so in regard to the work of other poets. As in the use of connective particles, nothing makes the versifier's task so pleasant and easy as repetition and verbal stuffing.

7. Eglisham cites two tautologies "dein rursus sole renato" and "nullo cum fine per aevum." Barclay explains the "rursus" away by some fancy punctuation which Buchanan evidently did not put in, but by-passes the other in silence. Neither does he answer Eglisham's accusation of repetitiveness in the use of the word *Pater* and the repeated use of words like *viridis*, *fecundus* et al. which in such a short poem should have been avoided by the substitution of synonyms.

8. Buchanan wrote verses like
   Squamigerae tremulâ per stagna liquentia caudâ
   or Exsultant tot monstra ingentia & horrida visu
   or Apparent accincte aurae flammaeque ministrae
   wherein too many words end either in a or in ae. Barclay cites Ovid with
   Cetera cum charta dextra loquuta mea est
   or Decepta est opera nulla puella mea
   which does not make these verses any better either.

9. Eglisham accuses Buchanan of using tags and *centos* in
   Aetheras aeternas Rector moliris habenas
   and Donec sera rubens accendat lumina vesper.
   Barclay refutes this by simply saying: "Hoc argumento accusat Homerum, accusat Virgilium, & plerosque Principes Poetas," whereby it is not quite clear from whom Homer should have taken his tags. But, as said above, verse lifting, if done by Buchanan, did not seem a sin to Barclay, rather a peculiar merit.

10. Finally, the most serious accusation of Eglisham against Buchanan is left unchallenged by Barclay, because here he could not possibly have defended Buchanan, and that is the accusation of "digressiones à sensu textûs, & omissiones partium textûs," as Eglisham dryly adds: ". . . ut collatione versuum cum sacro codice liquidò constabit."

What some of the metrical Psalm translations looked like we have shown in Table IV. The 70th Psalm has been chosen for purposes of comparison, partly because it is one of the shortest and one present in those collections at the author's disposal, partly because it contains some passages where the translators had to show some ingenuity, though of course not as many as for instance in the 104th Psalm.

The earliest metrical version we cite is that of Joannes Ganeius (T. IV, #II), published in Paris in 1547. His preface is in many ways typical. We have quoted generously from it on pages 272–273 and add here only that the author felt that after the appearance of Flaminius' translation in the preceding year he really ought not to have published his own. His friends, however, persuaded him and the thought of being helpful to the Church made him give in. (Exactly the same thing that Beza later said in regard to his own and Buchanan's translation.) Ganeius had been convinced that he was the first to use lyrical meters, but Flaminius had beaten him to it and he goes to great length to prove that he worked independently of Flaminius. People, he feels in quite a modern thought, have no longer the time to read the whole Bible, the Psalter is a sort of compendium of the Bible, wherefore he undertook to translate it directly from the Hebrew in order to by-pass all the obscurities of the Vulgata and make Psalter reading a rational and uplifting pleasure, as good by implication as reading the Bible itself. It is interesting to note that in what Vaganay (V 4) calls "l'inévitable épigramme" at the beginning Jean Dorat seems to hint already at some pedagogical use of the Psalms. His dedicatory poem[17] ends with the words:

> Cedite, qui linguam polientes, pectora coeno
> Collinitis: tanti non placet apta loqui.
> Cedat & eloquium, morum quod labe paratur:
> Hic pueris mores format, hic eloquium.

Hic, scil. Ganeius, is aware that a number of terms used by the Church were neither by word nor concept known in Cicero's time. He undertakes to create new ones and thus uses "fides pro religione, fidelis pro religioso, caro pro eo quem carnalem uocant, spiritus sanctus pro tertia persona, uerbum pro filio dei, gratia dei pro ea qua grati illi sumus," others he takes directly from the Hebrew as for instance "perdere animam, ingredi uiam patrum, pro mori" etc. "Hebraeorum autem nominum quantitatem aliquoties seruare neglexi, sequutus in hoc Prudentium: malensq; psalmum peregrinae linguae quantitate neglecta facilius exprimere, quàm seruata obscurius."

[17] "Joannes Auratus Lectori" on verso of title page.

The second version we cite in Table IV (#III) is by George Buchanan "poetarum nostri saeculi facile princeps," a title that in the hyperbolic language of the humanists meant no more than "distinguished" and was applied to innumerable poets and poetasters. The first edition of this version (Paris, 1566) carried the famous dedication to Mary Stuart which begins with the words "Nympha Caledoniae quae nunc feliciter orae / Missa per innumeros sceptra tueris avos. . ." George Saintsbury has rightly remarked that Buchanan's Psalm paraphrases are certainly "sufficiently elegant Latin" . . . . , "but then elegant Latin is about the last kind of medium suitable to Hebrew poetry."[18] He also says that "Johnson, whose liking for and acquaintance with modern Latin verse gave him probably a greater right to speak than any one now possesses, especially commended Buchanan for his freedom from mere *cento*-work. This freedom may be comparative, but it certainly is not positive." Of course not, Buchanan entertained the same ideas about literary perfection as his fellow humanists, which included close imitation of the Ancients and unabashed quotation. Saintsbury finds Buchanan's use of the hexameter in the longer and more descriptive Psalms tolerable, as well as that of the dimeter and trimeter couplet, but he thinks the lyric meters, such as the Alcaic and the choriambic meters quite impossible. He continues,

> Perhaps the chief historic interest of Buchanan's Psalter is that its production and popularity not improbably helped that disastrous process of translating the great medieval hymns which was carried on during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and which ultimately deprived the metrical portions of the Breviary of a very great part, if not of all, of the ineffable music and charm of those wonderful compositions. Even if the work of a heretic cannot be supposed to have had much direct influence in this way, it is none the less significant as a symptom.[19]

Well, where are we now? Buchanan is quite innocent of the disappearance of the medieval hymns, but he and his Catholic contemporaries shared the conviction of the superiority of classical over medieval forms of poetry, and of course neither could halt

[18] George Saintsbury, The Earlier Renaissance, vol. V of Periods of European Literature, New York, 1901, p. 53 seq.

[19] Ibid., p. 54 f.

the victorious advance of the vernaculars. Yet even the most cursory comparison of Buchanan's version with those of the other poets we cite shows the superiority of his work. It is comparatively free of what we would call "clichés" today, it follows the text, if not too closely, at least more closely than the others, it has dignity and here and there even felicitous phrases which are singularly absent in the work of the others, such as the last line: "Festinus fer opem mihi." Also it is less cluttered with "made-up" verses, shortest, tersest, and free from such weak expedients as repetitions and the excessive use of "fillers" and "stretchers."

The same can unfortunately not be said of the version by Joannes Matthaeus Toscanus (Table IV, #IV). His publisher Federicus Morelli remarks in the preface to the Paris edition of 1576 that quite a number of famous poets have already expressed the Psalms in Latin verses and mentions here Eobanus Hesse, Adamus Siberus, George Buchanan, and Benedictus Arias. To treat poetically the same subject matter that somebody else treated before you is perfectly legitimate, since the Ancients did it all the time. Still less could anyone be reproached for working on the Psalms, for no other ancient text is more obscure and difficult. Some poets, abounding in poetical gifts, do not quite get the meaning of the original, especially if they do not know Hebrew. Others stray for poetical reasons far from the text and add not only entire verses, but entire periods. They also may bring in such impious names and notions as Ceres, Bacchus, Fortuna, Sors, Fatum. Others are quite learned in Hebrew, but following the text too closely produce horrible poetry. There is still room for another poet who is not "vulgaris," who knows and appreciates Hebrew and who "cum Hebraicae linguae scientia coniunctam habeat religiosam ipsius obseruationem." Toscanus evidently was Jewish, yet, though it is difficult to judge his contribution to a better translation of the Hebrew original, it is certainly poor poetry that he produced in Latin.

Neither does Beza (Table IV, #V) come off very well. Verses like

Te colant hilares & vsque & vsque

or

Eheu ne, rogo, ne Deus, morare

are pretty bad, and where he introduced elegancies he is rather clumsy, as in

> Fac ignominiae notam reportant,
> Qui me ignominia volunt notatum

aside from the fact that Beza's hold on the original seems to be the most tenuous. Beza was, however, aware of his short-comings and his foreword is full of apologies. That his version found so many editions is something of a mystery and is probably attributable to his eminence in other fields of literary and theological endeavor. Nothing could be more incongruous than the "inevitable epigram," here written by Antonius Fayus, which begins with the words: Quò me, Beza, rapis? caelos subuectus in altos / Sydereas iam nunc te duce carpo vias.

The author has found it expedient to add (Table IV, #VI) the English translation in the King James version, as representing the best that could be done in straight vernacular translation around 1611. The Douay version does not differ very much from the King James version, except that it renders "Euge, euge" with "'tis well, 'tis well." Better than anything else this juxtaposition shows why Latin metrical Psalm translations were ultimately doomed to disappear. They could for a while survive as "littérature de collège,"[20] but could not possibly have the religious appeal and emotional immediacy that the great vernacular translations possessed. In fact, Saintsbury made the very striking, but quite justified, observation[21] that Latin "came to be best written in the smaller and less important nations — in those, too, which had dwindling or not yet adult vernaculars. The Scots, the Dutch, the Poles, the Germans were great at Latin; the French, the English, the Spaniards, the very Italians themselves, grew less and less expert in it, though some of these latter translated their works into Latin in order to cater for the larger auditory."

The reasons for the disappearance of creative writing in Latin and therewith also for the disappearance of metrical Bible translations are manifold and complex. It cannot be our task to investigate this problem in its entire extension, but only to mention a few

[20] Ibid., p. 59.
[21] Ibid., p. 60.

specific factors which within this general fading of interest in neo-Latin literature contributed particularly to the disappearance of metrical Bible translations.

A German schoolmaster by name of Kochhaff who latinized his name to Chytraeus (1543–1598) published in 1585 an enormously successful annotated edition of Buchanan's Psalm translation, his annotations and thirty different melodies, one for each of the meters that Buchanan used, being separately bound and sold together with Buchanan's text. The melodies set for four voices were partly collected from other composers and partly *ad hoc* composed by Statius Olthovius of Osnabrück, who served as choirmaster at the Rostock Latin School where Kochhaff taught, before he became rector of the Gymnasium in Bremen.[22] In the ponderously written, but interesting, foreword Nathan Chytraeus justifies his undertaking by telling that in 1579, when the curriculum of the Latin school in Rostock had been established, it had pleased the authorities to order that Buchanan should be read in the highest class so that the students would learn "veram pietatem, & linguae Romanae puritatẽ, varias etiam carminũ, maximè Lyricorum, dimensiones." Nothing could have suited Chytraeus better. He had already privately expounded Buchanan's Psalter to his own students. In dealing with the Psalms he first makes sure that everybody understands them perfectly as to text, phraseology and sense, so that when it comes to singing the Psalms his students will not sing like parrots. Therefore he has prefixed short "argumenta" to the Psalms and edited his own annotations and explanations. His students like so much to sing these Psalms that before and after the *exercitia scholastica* they are wont to sing them in perfect four-voice harmony without any notes. In fact, many carry the entire Psalter in their memory through this singing practice. The special beauty of this is also that once they know the melodies that Olthovius gave them they can with equal ease learn the Horatian Odes after which Buchanan fashioned his translation. For Chytraeus, Horace stands on the same level with Buchanan. The student should know both by heart. In fact he rather defends his predilection for Horace, "nam de Buchanano nemo, modò verè

[22] George Buchanan, Glasgow Quatercentenary Studies, 1906, Glasgow, 1907, p. 413.

pius & mediocriter eruditus sit, unquam dubitabit." There must have been doubts about his undertaking, because he makes the point that his annotations are not only useful to students, but also to those heavily laden with official business, who cannot afford to spend much time in puzzling out a difficult text. Nobody after all is forced to use either his annotations or Olthovius' music. The preface closes (like Ganeius' too) with a plug for another of his books which he had printed on his own account, libri XII Fastorum Ecclesiae Christianae.

The German Gymnasia of the 16th century placed much emphasis on Psalm singing. There was praying and singing three times a day, for instance in Johannes Sturm's school in Strassburg before instruction began, in the afternoon before the day scholars went home, and for the resident students before the evening meal.[23] Once a year the whole Psalter was to be sung through. In Strassburg the Psalter was even sung in Greek. Common exercises in Psalm and chorale singing took place on Saturdays after dinner. Similar practices are reported from Geneva where there was Psalm singing in school every day from 11:00–12:00 o'clock in the morning and there is no doubt that similar practices existed all over Protestant Europe.[24] The point to be made here is that metrical Psalm translations had become a school subject, a household instead of a luxury article. While Bradner[25] believes that the dropping of the Latin verse writing requirement from the curriculum of a few prominent schools "substantially decreased the number of those interested in Latin verse" in the 19th century, I think that in the period under consideration (1500–1620) it was rather the introduction of the Latin verse writing requirement which helped to undermine creative activity in this field. You do not as a grown-up repeat a schoolboy's exercises, neither do you spend money to buy any such exercises however perfect they may be.

Ultimately, of course, the vernaculars won out because among other reasons printing as a commercial enterprise needed a mass market. (A situation that has parallels in today's struggle for quality, which is not lucrative, on the part of TV, radio, stage and

[23] K. A. Schmid, Geschichte der Erziehung. Stuttgart, 1889, vol. 2, part 2, p. 349.
[24] Ibid., p. 271.
[25] Leicester Bradner, loc. cit., p. 340.

press and adaptation to the mass market, which is.) Where around 1500, if wide circulation of a text was to be achieved, it had to be translated into Latin, 120 years later the spread of literacy, the economical and technical perfection of printing, the existence and accessibility of vernacular literature and indeed the very perfection and standardization of the vernaculars themselves made it rather more advisable to print and publish in the vernacular. By 1620 Latin was no longer the only language in which a thought could be rendered with grace and precision, and though it continued to be the language of diplomacy, law, science, and scholarship for nearly 150 years more, it had ceased to be the only or even the principal language to convey poetic sentiments.

Also, the precious knowledge of ancient languages and literature, the wondrous skill and memory of the early humanists were by now within the reach of everyone. Magnificent dictionaries existed and equally magnificent editions of the ancient authors. Literary and linguistic knowledge that once had been the grace and privilege of a few had become commonplace, available to everyone and required in any better school.

Finally, there is a point of saturation which every art form reaches sooner or later. Certain works become accepted as classics, as insuperable standards of perfection within a style or art form, and the creative mind seeks new outlets. What in the days of Hesse and Buchanan had been a daring, interesting, novel task, had become in Barclay's days a schoolmasterly exercise, interesting perhaps to other schoolmasters, but no longer interesting enough to challenge the better writers.

Table I

Authors and Titles of Metrical Latin Psalm Translations Arranged by Date of First Edition, 1500–1620

Between 1497–1501
Antonius Giraldinus: Metaphrasis psalmorum VII poenitentialium litaniarumque. Paris. (V 6)
Another edition appeared 1515 in Erfurt. (V 6)

1529 Psalterium Dauidis carmine redditum per Eobanum Hessum. Marburg. (V 6)

1529 Jacobus Micyllus (Moltzer): some Psalms in his Poemata. Hagenau. (V 6)

1530 Salmonius Macrinus: the Seven Penitential Psalms "en vers lyriques." — (V 8)
Later editions contained a few more Psalms. (V 8)

1531 Franciscus Bonadus: Eximii Prophetarum Antistitis regia Dauidis oracula per F. Bonadum . . . numeris poeticis exarata. Paris. (V 8)

1531 Vincentius Obsopoeus (Koch): "quelques psaumes en distiques." Hagenau. (V 8)

1532 Psalmi omnium selectissimi adflictis conscientiis, ac Deum inuocantibus non uulgariter utiles, Latino carmine redditi per . . . Hermannum Nouae Aquilae comitem, Philippum Melanchthonem, Helium Eobanum Hessum, Iacobum Micyllum, Vincentium Obsopoeum, Petrum Pherntorphium. Hagenau. (BMC)

1533 Jacobus Latomus Junior: "traduction partielle." Basel. (V 9)

1536 Cornelius Musius: Odae et Psalmi. Poitiers. (V 10)
This work also contained a metrical Institutio foeminae christianae after the last chapter of Proverbs.

1538 Aluarus Gomez: Septem Elegiae in septem poenitentiae Psalmos. Toledo. (BMC)
In a metrical translation of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes jointly edited with Eobanus Hesse (Basel, same year) we find" . . . Psalmos aliquot carmine uersos, partim quam antea emendatiores, partim nunc primum in lucem aeditos . . ." by Vincentius Obsopoeus, Maurus Musaeus, Melanchthon, Arcturus Frisius, Erasmus Ebnerus, Macrinus Salmonius, Helius Eobanus Hessus. (V 10)

1540 Angelus de Faggis: "quelques psaumes imprimés à Venise en 1540, à Bâle en 1561 et à Rome en 1587." (V 10)

1540 Joannes Richius: Psalm XXXI in distichs. Marburg. (V 10)

1541 Joannes Fabritius Bollandus: "le psautier en vers lyriques." — (V 10)

1543 Joannes Stigelius: Psalm XC. — (BMC)

1544 Cornelius Crocus: Ode sacra tricolos tetrastrophos ad psalmum 45. iuxta Hebr. Verit. expensum in tranquillum ex turbulentiss. rerum statum diuinis. C. M. Victorijs partum et stabilitum Anno Dni. 1544. Amsterdam. (BMC)

1544 Joannes Spangebergius: "un psautier en distiques." Magdeburg. (V 10)

1546 M. Antonii Flaminii paraphrasis in triginta Psalmos versibus scripta. Venice. (BMC)

This very popular translation was completed by Franciscus Spinula and thus appeared for the first time in Paris (same year). (V 11)

It also was published at least five times (Venice, 1548, 1558; Florence, 1549, 1552 bis) in the Carmina quinque illustrium poetarum.

1547 Sebastianus Castalio: "une traduction en vers lyriques de la plus grande partie du psautier." Basel. (V 12)

1547 Joannes Ganeius: Psalmi Dauidici Septuaginta quinque, in lyricos versus, seruata ecclesiasticae uersionis ueritate & Hebraeorum uarietate, redacti. Paris. (BMC)

1552 or earlier

Jovita Rapicius (Ravizza): "la paraphrase en mètres variés de plusieurs psaumes." Venice. (V 12)

1552 Hector Bernodius: "les VII psaumes de la pénitence en distiques." Paris. (V 12)

1556 Davidis psalmi aliquot Latino carmine expressi a quatuor illustribus poetis, quos quatuor regiones, Gallia, Italia, Germania, Scotia, genuerunt; in gratiam studiosorum poetices inter se commissi ab Henrico Stephano: cujus etiam nonnulli psalmi Graeci cum aliis Graecis itidem comparati in calce libri habentur. Paris. Contained 18 Psalms translated by Buchanan. (George Buchanan, Glasgow Quatercentenary Studies, p. 407.)

1556 Johannes Major Joachim: Psalmi duo CXXXI. et CXXV. explicati carmine elegiaco. Item, Cymba Christi Math. octauo. Wittemberg. (BMC)

1556 First appearance of some metrical Psalm translations in the Poemata of Adamus Siberus (Basel); the translation of the entire Psalter appeared, also in Basel, in 1562. (V 13)

1557 Joannes Sascerides: Carmina sacra, Books I–V. Basel. (V 13)

1558 First separate publication of 15 Psalms in various meters by Petrus Nannius. Louvain. (V 13)

They had previously appeared in one edition of Latomus' version.

1559 Psalm XXX and Psalm XLI, "Carmine redditus," both separately published by Erasmus Flock. Nürnberg. (BMC)

1559 Henricus baro in Harremberg: "quelques Psaumes mis en vers." Wittemberg. (V 13)

1561 Pasquillus Merus (Conradus Sutphanus): "une traduction en distiques de quelques psaumes et cantiques bibliques." —(V. 13)

1561 Angelus Sangrinus: In Psalterium Dauidis . . . Paraphrasis vario metri genere exculta. Basel. (BMC)

1562 Thomae Mitis Nymburgeni varij generis Odae in Psalmos Dauidis Poenitentiales, atque Propheticos de Christo . . . Addita est Elegia in 53. caput Esaiae . . . Prague. (BMC)

1562 In the Orationes, Dialogi, Epistolae, Carmina of Olympia Fulvia Morata are a number of Psalms translated into Greek, but among them also two (XLVI and CL) in Latin hexameters and distichs by Carolus Utenhovius and one (XLVI) in sapphic strophes by Xystus Betuleius. Basel. (V 13)

1562 Adamus Siberus: the entire Psalter in distichs. Basel. (V 13)

1563 Christophorus Montanus: the Seven Penitential Psalms in distichs. — (V 14)

1564 Probable first edition of Buchanan's entire paraphrase.

1565 Philippe Belvatius (or Bellevaletus): "les psaumes I–L en vers lyriques." Douai. (V 14)

1566 Michael Biblius: Breuis precationum libellus, quatuor Psalmorum, elegiaco carmine scriptus. Wittemberg. (BMC)

1566 PSALMORUM Dauidis paraphrasis poetica, nunc primum edita, Authore Georgio Buchanano, Scoto, poetarum nostri saeculi facile principe. Eiusdem Dauidis Psalmi aliquot a Th. B. V. versi. PSALMI aliquot in versus item Graecos nuper a diuersis translati. Geneva. (or Paris?) (V 12)

The "Psalmi aliquot" are psalms I, II, VI, XV, XVIII, and CIV

by Theodore Beza (Vezelius). (V 12) This may be the second edition of one which appeared originally in either Paris or Geneva in 1564 or 1565. (George Buchanan, Glasgow Quatercentenary Studies, p. 407.)

1567 Fridericus Widebramus: Psalms LI and XLI in hexameters. Leipzig. (V 16 seq.)

Was later followed by a translation of the entire Psalter. (V 17)

1568 Jean Rhumelius: "une traduction des psaumes et des Lamentations de Jérémie." Cahors. (V 14)

1572 Joachim Camerarius: the Penitential Psalms in iambs and eight other Psalms in various meters. Leipzig. (V 14)

1572 Sebastianus Schefferus: Psalmi Dauidici quinque grassantis pestilentiae tempore consolatorij, elegiaco carmine redditi. — (BMC)

1573 Hermannus comes a Nuenare (Novae Aquilae): the Seven Penitential Psalms, published by Joachim Camererius. — (V 14)

1574 Dauidis regis ac prophetae aliorumque sacrorum vatum Psalmi ex Hebraica veritate in Latinum carmen a Benedicto Aria Montano . . . conuersi. Antwerp. (BMC)

1574 J. Christophorus Fuchs: Paraphrasis Psalmorum Davidis vario carminum genere. Schmalkalden. (V 14)

1575 Joannes Matthaeus Toscanus: Psalmi Dauidis ex hebraïca veritate latinis versibus expressi. Paris. (BMC)

1576 Gregorius Bersmanus: Four Psalms (CXVI, CVIII, CXII, CXLI) in his Poemata. Leipzig. (V 16)

1578 Michael Hempelus: "une traduction qui doit être en distiques." — (V 16)

1579 Theodorus Beza Vezelius: Psalmorum Dauidis et aliorum Prophetarum libri quinque. Argumento & Latina paraphrasi illustrati, ac etiam vario carminum genere Latine expressi. Geneva. (BMC)

1579 Joannes Engerdus: "la paraphrase de la prière de Moïse, ou psaume XC." Ingolstadt. (V 16)

1579 Psalmi Davidis a G. Buchanano versibus expressi: nunc primum modulis iiii, v, vi, vii, et viii. vocum, a I. Servino decantati. London. Contains only Psalms 1 to 41. (George Buchanan, Glasgow Quatercentenary Studies, p. 410.)

1580 Bartholomaeus Botta: Davidias — "une traduction en hexamètres et en distiques." — (V 18)

1580 Jo. Rudolphus Leemannus: the Psalter in hendecasyllables. Zurich. (V 18)

1581 Wolfgangus Ammonius "insère quelques psaumes dans ses Odae au milieu de traductions d'hymnes allemandes." — (V 18)

1581 Scipio Gentilis: Paraphrasis aliquot Psalmorum Dauidis, carmine heroico. London. (BMC)

1581 Franciscus Mourettus (François Mouret): Enchiridion Psalmorum Davidis regii prophetae ex hebraica veritate . . . in latinum carmen redactum . . . Paris. (V 18)

". . . son Enchiridion se déroule d'une façon monotone en distiques désespérément plats." (V 18)

1582 Paean Stephani Parmenii Budeji ad psalmum Dauidis CIV. conformatus, & gratiarum loco, post prosperam ex suis Pannoniis in Angliam peregrinationem, Deo optimo & er [o?] maximo seruatori consecratus. London. (BMC)

1583 Hilarion Tadinus: the Penitential Psalms in Hexameters. — (V 20)

1585 Matthias Theodori: the Penitential Psalms in distichs. Bremen. (V 20)

1586 Ludovicus Crucius Olysipponensis: Interpretatio poetica latine in centum quinquaginta psalmos. — (V 22)

1587 Jacobus Latomus Junior: "la traduction complète en distiques." Antwerp. (V 9)

1587 Mauritius, Landgravius Hassiae: the Psalter in various meters. Schmalkalden. (V 20)

1587 Franciscus Moncaeus: Psalm XLIV together with the Song of Solomon. Paris. (V 20)

1588 First appearance of a popular musical setting of Buchanan's translation: Psalmorum Dauidis paraphrasis poëtica Georgii Buchanani Scoti. Argumentis ac melodiis explicata atque illustrata, opera et studio Nathanis Chytraei. Herborn. (BMC)

1590 Petrus Bellaeus: Poetica Paraphrasis Cantici Canticorum Salomonis, Psalmi CXIX, duorum canticorum Zachariae & Mariae, & capitis LIII Iesaiae Prophetae . . . Geneva. (BMC)

1590 Duodecim Psalmi Davidis, ab anonymo quodam, poeta elegantiss. vario carminum genere pene ad verbum, et admodum feliciter expressi are found in an anthology Selectorum Carminum Ex Doctiss. Poetis Collectorum . . . Libri Qvatvor; the psalms

are actually translated by various (Spanish ?) authors who signed with the initials N. C. A. D., I. A., and I. L. G. — (V 21)

Between 1590–1600
Andreas Calagius: 60 Psalms. Breslau. (V 23)

Between 1590–1600
Janus Lernutius: Psalm CXIV in his 4th Epinicion in Delitiae C Poetarum Belgicorum. — (V 22)

1591 David Crinitus: "le psautier mis en odes." Prague. (V 21)

1592 Gilbertus Cognatus: 4 Psalms in various meters in Odae sacrae in his Opera. Basel. (V 21 seq.)

1592 Conchylius Romanaeus (Guido Cocquille): the Psalter in hexameters. Nevers. (V 22)

1592 Quirinus Herlinus: the Psalter "en hendecasyllabes et en quatrains" with a German translation. Leipzig. (V 22)

1593 Joannes Fritscius: "dédié a l'empereur Rodolphe II une traduction du psautier dans laquelle il n'a pas employé moins de cent espèces de vers." Buda (?). (V 22)

1594 Gregorius Bersmanus: Psalmorum Dauidis LXII, post omnes omnium aliorum paraphrasis poetica non contemnenda, vario carminum genere expressa. Zerbst. (BMC)

1596 Adamus Crato: the Seven Penitential Psalms. Magdeburg. (V 22)

1596 Sebastianus Hornmoldus: Dauidis regii prophetae psalmi, puris ac perpetuis iambis . . . expressi. Tübingen. (BMC)

1596 Andreas Spethe: "une traduction qui fut mise en musique par Ambrosius Lobwasser." Heidelberg. (V 22)

1597 Christianus Egenolphus: the entire Psalter. Frankfurt. (V 22)

1597 Jacobus Lectius: "quelques psaumes dans les ⟨⟨Poemata⟩⟩." Geneva. (V 23), also Ecclesiastes and Jonah. (Biographie Universelle, Paris, 1843 and later.) His versions of Eccl. & Jonah appeared frequently with Beza's publications, e.g. 1588, 1599, and 1614, Geneva.

1597 Georgius Tilenus Aurimontanus Silesius: eight Psalms in his Poematum libri octo. Leipzig. (V 22)

1597 William Vaughan: *Ἐρωτοπαίγνιον* pium: Continens Canticum Canticorum Salomonis, et Psalmos aliquot selectiones. Part I, London, 1597, Part II, Ibid., 1598. (Dict. of National Biography, New York, 1885 and later.)

1598 Gregorius Bersmanus: the Psalter translated in 58 different meters. Hanover. (V 16)

This might possibly be the same translation as mentioned under 1594; "cette curiosité littéraire" (V 16) saw three editions, 1598, 1611 and 1627, in Hanover, Zerbst and Leipzig respectively.

1599 Balduinus Berlicomius: "le psautier presque en son entier." Heidelberg. (V 23)

1601 "Hassaeus et ses strophes saphiques . . ." Lübeck. (V 23)

1607 Caspar Cunradus: Psalmodiae Dauidicae metaphrasis poetica. Oels. 1607 (BMC)

1607 Joannes Bochius: Psalmorum Dauidis parodia heroica. Antwerp. (BMC)

1608 Valentinus Cremcovius: "la mise en latin de la traduction allemande de Cornelius Becker." — (V 23)

1610 Jacobus Antonius Vulpius: Psalmi Davidis aliquot quiquod suis locis opportune Estherae historiae possunt inseri . . . carmine vario huc tralati . . . for his Estheraeis. — (BMC)

1614 P. H. Homagius: Psalmi II. meditatio, hisce temporibus accomodata. — (BMC)

1618 Duellum poeticum. Contendentibus, Georgio Eglisemmio . . . & Georgio Buchanano . . . pro dignitate paraphraseos Psalmi centesimi quarti . . . London. (BMC)

1618 Johannes Campanus Vodnianus: Sacrarum odarum libri duo, quorum prior psalmos Davidicos, posterior hymnos . . . continet. Accessere Cantica Canticorum in Odaria LIII., necnon melodiae pro omnibus psalmis, odis et Canticorum odariis. eiusdem authoris. Frankfurt. 1618. (BMC)

1618 Franciscus Husmanus: Davidis Psalterium, Latinis hexametris redditum et omnibus philomusis Christianis . . . relictum. Celle. (BMC)

1619 Arthur Johnston: Consilium de mania G. Eglishemii. Paris and Edinburgh. (Leicester Bradner, Musae Anglicanae. New York, 1940, p. 354.)

1620 Dominicus Lampsonius: the Seven Penitential Psalms published in Hymnorum Liturgicon . . . liber, edited by Victor Giselinus, Antwerp. 1626 published separately in Liege. (V 22)

1620 Ecphrasis paraphraseos Georgii Buchanani in Psalmos Davidis:

ab Alexandro Jvlio, Edinburgeno, in adolescentiae studiosae gratiam elaborata . . . London. A school edition which made use of Buchanan's own explanations as given by him to his nephew Thomas Buchanan. (George Buchanan, Glasgow Quatercentenary Studies, p. 416.)

Table II

Tabulation of all Printings of Metrical Latin Psalm Translations by Year and Place of Publication in 5-year Intervals Between 1500–1620

P indicates editions of the entire or nearly entire Psalter.

S indicates editions of parts of the Psalter or of individual Psalms.

1500–1505 P: —
S: Paris (Giraldinus, between 1497–1501)

1506–1510 P: —
S: —

1511–1515 P: —
S: Erfurt (Giraldinus, 1515)

1516–1520 P: —
S: —

1521–1525 P: —
S: —

1526–1530 P: Marburg 1529
S: Hagenau 1529; s. l. 1530

1531–1535 P: Paris 1531
S: s. l. 1531; Hagenau 1532; Basel 1533

1536–1540 P: Marburg 1538; Strassburg 1539
S: Poitiers 1536, 1538; Paris 1537; Toledo, Basel 1538; Venice, Marburg 1540

1541–1545 P: s. l. 1541, 1543; Strassburg 1542, 1544; Magdeburg 1544
S: Amsterdam 1544

1546–1550 P: Paris 1546, 1547, 1549 bis; Basel 1547, 1548
S: Venice 1546, 1548; Paris 1547; Lyon 1548 bis; Florence 1549; Basel 1550

1551–1555 P: Paris 1551; Basel 1554(?); Antwerp 1555
S: Venice 1551(?); Florence 1552; Paris 1552 bis

1556–1560 P: Geneva 1556; Paris 1556(?), 1557, 1558; Antwerp 1558

S: s. l., Paris, Basel 1556; Wittemberg 1556, 1559; Venice 1558; Louvain 1558 bis; Nürnberg 1558 bis

1561–1565 P: Basel 1561 bis; 1562, 1565; Cologne, Frankfurt 1561; Venice 1564; Paris 1565

S: Jena 1561; s. l. 1562, 1563; Basel, Prague, Antwerp 1562; Wittemberg 1563; Douai 1565

1566–1570 P: Geneva 1566 bis; Paris, Strassburg 1566, 1568; s. l. 1567(?); Antwerp 1566, 1567; Cahors 1568

S: Wittemberg 1566; Leipzig 1567 Antwerp 1571, s. l. 1572

1571–1575 P: Schmalkalden, Antwerp 1574; Paris 1575 bis

S: s. l. 1572, 1573; Leipzig 1572; Antwerp 1572 bis; Paris 1575; Strassburg 1575

1576–1580 P: Paris 1576; s. l. 1578; Geneva 1579; London 1580 ter; Padua(?), Zurich 1580; Strassburg 1578; London 1579

S: Lyon 1576; Leipzig 1576, 1580; Ingolstadt 1579

1581–1585 P: Venice, Morges, Paris, London 1581; Antwerp 1582; Frankfurt 1585

S: s. l. 1581, 1583; London 1581, 1582, 1584; St. Gallen 1582; Bremen 1585

1586–1590 P: s. l. Cologne 1586; Schmalkalden 1587, 1590; Antwerp 1587, 1588; Herborn 1588, 1590; Geneva 1590

S: Rome, Paris 1587; s. l. Geneva 1590

1591–1595 P: Prague, Geneva 1591; s. l. Nevers, Herborn, Leipzig, London 1592; Geneva, Buda, Schmalkalden 1593; Geneva 1594; Leyden, Herborn 1595

S: Basel, Wittemberg 1592; Zerbst 1594; Breslau, s. l. 1595(?)

1596–1600 P: Heidelberg 1596, 1599; Tübingen 1596; Frankfurt 1597; Wittemberg, Siegen 1597; Hanover 1598

S: Magdeburg 1596; Leipzig 1597; London 1597, 1598; Geneva 1599; Herborn 1600

1601–1605 P: Châlons-sur-Marne 1601; Lübeck 1601; Leipzig 1602; Frankfurt 1605

S: —

1606–1610 P: Antwerp 1607, 1608 bis; Oels 1607; s. l. 1608; Leyden 1609; Herborn 1610

S: s. l. 1610

1611–1615 P: Zerbst, Edinburgh 1611, 1615

S: s. l. 1614

1616–1620 P: Herborn 1616, 1619; Frankfurt, Celle 1618; London 1620
S: London 1618; Antwerp 1620

Table III

Metrical Translations of Biblical Books into Latin Except Psalm Translations, according to Authors and Years of First Edition 1494–1621

1494 Matthaeus Vindocinensis: Tobit. Lyon. This Latin versification was published in a popular anthology Auctores octo opusculorum which contained such short works as Aesop's Fables and Alanus' de Insulis Liber Parabolarum. Seems to have been considered a classic for younger readers and achieved seven editions between 1494 and 1525.

1528 Christophorus Hegendorphinus: Gospel of St. John. Hagenau; also Halle 1540 and Paris 1542.

1529 Alvarus Gomez: Epistles. Alcalá de Henares.

1533 Helius Eobanus Hesse: Ecclesiastes. Nürnberg.

1536 Cornelius Musius: vid. Tab. I.

1537 Franciscus Bonadus: Epistles. Basel.

1539 Joannes Spangebergius: The Liturgical Gospels. Wittemberg; reprinted 1560 and 1570(?) in Frankfurt.

1544 Joannes Lorichius: Ecclesiasticus. Ingolstadt.

1545 Sebastianus Castalio: Jonah. Basel.

1550 Andreas Desi: Tobit. Debrecen.

1552 Paulus Chimarrhaeus: The Liturgical Epistles "ad usum Scholae Marcodurẽsis." Cologne.

1554 Georgius Aemilius: The Liturgical Gospels. Cologne.

1562 Stephanus Culingius: Zechariah. Strassburg.

1562 Thomas Mitis Nymburgenus: vid. Tab. I.

1568 Jean Rhumelius: vid. Tab. I.

1569 Johannes Hedericus: Isaiah. Wittemberg.

1570 Gilbertus Genebrardus: Canticles. Paris; reprinted ibidem 1585.

1574 Christianus Egenolphus: Canticles. Frankfurt.

1575 Christophorus Formicarius: Jonah. Schmalkalden.

1584 Theodorus Beza Vezelius: Canticles. Geneva.

1587 Franciscus Moncaeus: Canticles. vid. Tab. I.

1588	Jacobus Lectius:	Ecclesiastes "heroico carmine" together with a translation by Beza.	Geneva.
1588	Jac. Aug. Thuanus (J. A. De Thou):	Job, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations of Jeremiah, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Habakkuk.	Tours.
1590	Thomas Schotisius:	Ecclesiastes and Jonah.	Alkmaar.
1595	Henricus Meibomius:	Isaiah.	Helmstedt
1597	Jacobus Lectius:	Jonah. vid. Tab. I.	
1597	William Vaughan:	Canticles.	London
1598	Andreas Hoius:	Ezekiel	Douai
1599	Joachimus Hossmann:	Canticles	Görlitz
1600	Joannes Ruxelius:	Lamentations of Jeremiah	Rouen
1604	Johannes Bridges:	New Testament	London
1604	Martinus Henisius:	Proverbs	Wittemberg
1605	Janus Chunradus Rhumelius:	Amos (Amberg ?)	"Ambergae"
1609	Alexander Julius:	5th chapter of Isaiah	Edinburgh
1610	Jacobus Antonius Vulpius:	Esther. vid. Tab. I.	
1611	Alexander Julius:	Malachi and 3 chapters of Isaiah (4, 5, 11)	Edinburgh
1611	Solomon Codomannus:	Canticles	Giessen
1612	Joannes Claius: an anthology Delitiae poetarum	Ecclesiastes Germanorum	s. l. in
1618	Johannes Campanus Vodnianus:	Canticles	vid. Tab. I.
1621	Janus Chunradus Rhumelius:	Esther	Nürnberg

Table IV

Comparison of Various Metrical Translations of the 70th Psalm

I) Original version according to the Biblia Sacra Latina. London, Bagster & Sons, s. a., p. 382 (Vulgata)

Psalmus LXX

In finem, Psalmus David, In rememorationem, quòd salvum fecerit eum Dominus.

II) Ioannes Ganeius: Psalmi Davidici Septvaginta . . . . . Paris, 1547, leaf 148 verso

Victori Dauid ad recordandum Psal. 70. Ode monocolos

DEUS, in adjutorium meum intende:
Domine, ad adjuvandum me festina.
2 Confundantur, et revereantur, qui quaerunt animam meam:
3 Avertantur retrorsum, et erubescunt, qui volunt mihi mala: Avertantur statim erubescentes, qui dicunt mihi: Euge, euge.
4 Exultent et laetentur in te omnes qui quaerunt te, et dicant semper: Magnificetur Dominus: qui diligunt salutare tuum.
5 Ego vero egenus, et pauper sum: Deus, adjuva me. Adjutor meus, et liberator meus es tu: Domine ne moreris.

Festina age ô deus,
Vt me tot ê malis
Queis angor, eruas,
Praesentem opem & feras.
2 Vt qui mihi male
volunt, & ad necem
Innoxium petunt,
Pudore sentiant
Infamiáq; se
Notabiles: 3 & in
Malam retro crucem
Eant, malis meis
Qui gratulantur, &
In ijs sibi placent.
4 Vertantur in fugam
Qui turpiter mihi
Ogganniunt ohe:
5 Contráq; gaudeant,
Quicunq; te & tuum
Nomen sacrum ambiunt,
Et anxiè obsecrant:
Dicántq; iugiter
Quibus salus tua
Cordi est, & abs te eam
Quicunque postulant,
Magni aestimetur, ut
Permagnus est deus.
6 Ego autem egenus &
Pauper quia ô deus,
Hucusq; uictito:
Festina & huc propè
Accede: ut adiuues,
Mihíque opem feras:
7 Nec differ obsecro
Diutius: meus
Nam solus es potens
Seruator, & deus.

III) George Buchanan: Psalmorum Dauidis paraphrasis poetica . . . Paris 1566. p. 126

Psal. LXX, Deus in adiutorium meum intende: &c.

O Deus, praesens ades, & periclis
Me praesentibus eripe:
O Deus, duros propera labores
Confestim auxilio vt leues.
Qui meam quaerunt animam, erubescant:
Foedam ignominiam ferant
Et fuga turpi doleant, malignis
Qui me consiliis petunt.
Terga dent, fusos pudor vt perurat,
Qui rident gemitus meos.
Téque clementi & placido fruantur
Qui gaudent placitis tuis.
Qui salutis spem posuere in vno
Te certam penitus Deo,
Gaudeant, sempérque canant, Perennis
Maiestas & honor Deo.
Sunt meae vires & opes pusillae:
Sed tu me Deus adiuua.
Tu meae vires, mea spes, opésque:
Festinus fer opem mihi.

IV) Joannes Matthaeus Toscanus: Psalmi Davidis . . . Paris 1576. p. 62 et verso

Psalmus LXX. (follows a short argumentum by Ioannes Auratus)
Victori, ipsius Dauidis ad commemorandum.

INstantis vt periculi
A me Deus repellas
Nubem, feras celerrimae
Opem, precor, salutis.
2 Vitámque nostram perdere
Qui quaeritant malignè,
His ora turpi infamia
Rubor notet pudenda:
Retro rubentes, qui meo
malo student, ferantur.
3 Fuga incitanti praemium
Sui ferant pudoris,
Qui gestientes gaudio
Euax sonant, & euax.
4 In te fruatur gaudio
Te turba quaeritantum:
Amore quisquis tangitur
Sancto tuae salutis,
Dicat: perenni gloria
Magnus Deus colatur.
5 Exspes, egenus moereo:
Haud lentus huc adesto,
In quo salutis, ac mei
Spes auxilî recumbit:
Ergo secundus labere,
Morásque rumpe lentas.

V) Theodore Beza: PSALMORUM DAVIDIS . . . LIBRI QVINQUE. Geneva 1579. p. 319.

Psalmus septuagesimus monocolos, carmine phalaecio hendecasyllabo, vt secundus.

1 ADfer promptus opem, Deus, roganti,
Succurre approperans periclitanti:
2 Fac istos pudor obruat nocentes,
Student perdere quotquot innocentem:
Infamésque procul semel repelle,
Dura tot mihi damna machinatos:
3 Fac ignominiae notam reportant,
Qui me ignominia volunt notatum.
Truci pectore prosequi assueti,
Mordaci gemitus meo cachinno.
4 At qui pectore te pio requirunt
Te colant hilares & vsque & vsque
Et quicunque tua abs salute pendent,
Illis perpetuas tibi canendas
Deus suppedita, supreme, laudes.
5 Adsum pauper ego, misérque prorsus,
Seruato approperans Deus rogantem,
Vnus tu mihi nánque liberator,
Vnus praesidium periclitanti,
Eheu ne, rogo, ne, Deus, morare.

VI) English Version according to the Holy Bible in the King James Version of 1611. American Bible Society, N. Y., s. a. p. 553

PSALM 70

To the chief Musician, *A Psalm* of David, to bring to remembrance.

Make haste, O God, to deliver me; make haste to help me, O LORD
2 Let them be ashamed and confounded that seek after my soul: let them be turned backward, and put to confusion, that desire my hurt.
3 Let them be turned back for a reward of their shame that say, Aha, aha.
4 Let all those that seek thee rejoice and be glad in thee: and let such as love thy salvation say continually, Let God be magnified.
5 But I *am* poor and needy; make haste unto me, O God: thou *art* my help and my deliverer, O LORD, make no tarrying.

THE SALE OF MONK CERTIFICATES DURING THE SUNG DYNASTY

A factor in the decline of Buddhism in China

KENNETH CH'EN
Harvard University

Historians of Buddhism in China have long ago noted the fact that after the T'ang dynasty Buddhism no longer played a creative rôle in the literature and arts of China, and that the Buddhist church ceased to make any significant contributions toward the religious and social life of the nation. Some people are inclined to attribute this decline of Buddhism to the suppression of 845, when 260,000 monks and nuns were ordered defrocked, and over 40,000 temples and shrines ordered destroyed. It was held that the religion never recovered from this blow. However, this view does not take into account the fact that during certain periods of the Sung dynasty, the number of monks and nuns actually exceeded that under the T'ang; in 1021, monks 397,615, nuns 61,239; in 1034, monks 385,220, nuns 48,742. It would be necessary therefore to look for some other factors to account for the decline in the influence of the sangha, especially during and after the Sung dynasty.

This problem may be approached from several aspects. Probably quite a number of factors were at work contributing toward the decline. We might mention, for instance, the organization of the Buddhist doctrine in China. The two schools of Buddhism which became dominant after the T'ang were the Ch'an (Zen) and the Pure Land. Both of these schools were somewhat anti-intellectual and anti-literary, so to speak. The Ch'an masters called upon their disciples to abandon the mental discipline which the detailed study of the scriptures entailed; they said that one could attain Buddhahood immediately after putting down the butcher's knife, or that the truth was not expressed in words or written in letters. They would do away with all the sacred scriptures, they contended that the paper on which the sutras were written was fit only to wipe the pus off their carbuncles, they enjoined upon all

to live naturally, to eat, drink, and move their bowels regularly. The Pure Land adherents were likewise interested only in repeating their formula, *namo Amitabha, namo Amitabha,* endlessly, and saw no need for the voluminous mass of literature. When such was the intellectual climate within the Buddhist religion, creative minds in literature and philosophy stayed away from it, and this was responsible, it is contended, for the decline of the religion after the Sung dynasty.

Other factors that might have played their rôles were the temperament of the Chinese people and their culture, the social organization of the Chinese, or the intellectual atmosphere after the Sung dynasty. Much could be said about any one of these as contributing factors in the decline of the sangha. However, in this paper, I propose to confine myself to just one aspect which had to do with the monastic organization of Buddhism, namely the sale of monk certificates, and its connection with the economic distress faced by the Sung dynasty.

Two factors, one internal, and one external, appear to have been the main causes of the economic distress faced by the Sung dynasty. Externally, the dynasty was constantly threatened by invasions and attacks along the northern frontiers. In the northeast were the Khitans, in the northwest, the Tanguts. Later, in the twelfth century, the danger was augmented by a Tungusic people called Nuchen by the Chinese, who established the Chin or Golden dynasty. Defense of the northern borders against the encroachments of these invaders necessitated a large standing army which had to be paid and supplied. The increase in the Sung army may be seen in the following figures:

Date	*Army Total*	*Population*
969–976	378,000	
995–997	666,000	
1017–1021	912,000	
1041–1048	1,250,000	21,830,000
1064–1067	1,162,000	29,000,000

It was estimated that 200 strings of cash approximately were needed to provide food and clothing for one soldier, so that in an army of over a million men, over 200,000,000 strings of cash

would be necessary. However, the full amount was not always expended for each soldier, it seems, so that in 1065 the expenses for the army were said to total 50,000,000 strings of cash. Tax income during the years 1049–53 amounted only to about 39,000,000 strings of cash; in 1064–67, 44,000,000 strings, far below the requirements needed to maintain the army.

Nor were the army expenses the only item involved. The Sung emperors also pursued a policy of buying peace with the northern adversaries by paying large amounts of indemnity annually. During the early years such indemnity to the Khitans amounted to about 200,000 strings annually; later this was increased to 500,000 strings. To the Tanguts the annual amount was about 250,000 strings. In the Southern Sung period, annual payments to the Nuchen were at first 250,000 strings of cash and 250,000 bolts of silk; later this was increased to 300,000 each.

In addition to defense expenditures, the national treasury was also drained heavily by the enormous expenses of supporting a large number of supernumeraries in the government. It seems that there were no limits placed on the number of officials employed by the government. For example, the areas of the prefectures and departments were no larger than formerly, but the number of local officials was more than double that under the former dynasty. In numerous cases, though officials no longer held posts, they still continued to receive official emoluments. These supernumeraries got on the government payrolls largely through the Sung system of official protection, by which sons and grandsons, and even relatives of officials would be recommended for governmental posts, even though some would still be in their teens. As the army increased, one would expect the number of supernumeraries to be decreased so that economy might be achieved in one branch of the government to make up for the increased expenses of supporting a larger army. Yet the reverse was true. During the period when the army consisted of 912,000 men, members of the imperial clans holding offices totalled 9,785. At the time the army numbered 1,250,000 men, the members of the imperial clan receiving official emoluments increased to 15,443. Numerous complaints were heard about the rise in the number of bureaucrats. In 1088, for instance, the total of government employees was said

to be four times that of the period 1004–1007; in 1109 the complaint was that the bureaucray had increased tenfold over that of the preceding reign. This amorphous Sung bureaucracy, with large numbers occupying sinecures, had to be paid, as was the army, out of the limited national treasury. It was no wonder therefore that the Sung government was continually hardpressed for funds to meet the recurring financial crisis.

To cope with this problem, the dynasty resorted to all sorts of schemes to raise money. Three of these had to do with the Buddhist church, the sale of monk certificates, the sale of the honorary title, Master of the Purple Robe, and the imposition of a payment for being exempted from taxation and the corvée.

The practice of conferring monk certificates started out as an attempt to improve the moral and intellectual atmosphere of the monastic community, but ended as one of the chief instruments which led to the corruption and degeneration of the sangha. The practice started in 747 under the T'ang dynasty. It appears that the T'ang ruler at that time was becoming alarmed over the large number of able-bodied men and women who were seeking refuge in the Buddhist monasteries. Very often they joined the sangha to escape from their tax or corvée responsibilities, or even from the law. The throne first attempted to weed out these undesirable elements by conducting periodic purges of the monastic community and forcing them to return to laity. Realizing that such measures were inadequate, the dynasty inaugurated in 747 a system of official ordination, under which monks would be ordained in ceremonies sponsored by the state, and given a monk certificate by the Bureau of Sacrifices. Only those monks possessing these certificates were to be considered as being duly and officially ordained. Such a method, in addition to prohibiting private ordination of monks, also served to limit the size of the sangha by refusing ordination to all those considered undesirable. Part of the ceremonies consisted of the candidate passing an examination testing his knowledge of the Buddhist scriptures. The text most often used was the Saddharma Pundarika, and the candidate was required to recite from memory a certain number of pages.

Though the idea was admirable, events soon after rendered the system ineffective. The aftermath of the An Lu-shan rebellion,

which broke out in 755, left the imperial treasury empty. No funds were available to purchase supplies for the army suppressing the rebellion. At this juncture the government decided upon the scheme of selling monk certificates to obtain revenue, the price of a certificate being 100 strings of cash. It is recorded that large numbers of such certificates were sold in the two capitals, Loyang and Chang-an, bringing in a total of over a million badly needed strings of cash. After this episode, it seemed that the government ceased the sale of certificates, although some local officials in the outlying areas continued the practice and pocketed the income themselves.

This granting of monk certificates was carried over into the Sung dynasty and during the early years an elaborate course of action was prescribed before one could obtain the document. The candidate had first to undergo a period of instruction and training as a novice. To start with, he presented a petition to the master of a monastery, giving the following information: name, native place, age, desire to leave the household life, the approval of the parents for such a step, the absence of any criminal brands on his body, etc. After the presentation of this petition, the candidate was then granted an interview with the head of the monastery to determine his qualifications and his sincerity. One who was under 19, one who had been defrocked, or an outlaw from justice, would not be accepted. Once accepted, he then went to live within the monastery, where he had to study the Buddhist scriptures, perform menial tasks for the older monks, and observe the five cardinal precepts. (These were to abstain from killing, lying, stealing, adultery, and intoxicating spirits.) He did not shave his head nor did he wear the monastic robe. After one year as a novice he became eligible for an examination on the sacred scriptures. This examination normally consisted of reciting 100 pages and reading 500 pages of text. Again the Saddharma was usually chosen. Upon the successful completion of this examination, the certificate was granted to the candidate, who then went to his master for the tonsure and ordination. This certificate contained information concerning his given and his religious names, native place, age, the monastery he was attached to, name of his master, date of the conferring of the certificate. He was to retain this certificate as

long as he lived. It was to serve as the identification of his status, to be carried about whenever he travelled. Whenever he went to another monastery, his certificate would be checked and passed upon by the abbot of that monastery before he was granted permission to stay. Once he obtained this certificate, he enjoyed a special position in the realm. He was exempted from all forms of labor and military services, and also from the normal tax burdens which other male adults of the state had to bear. Moreover, officials were prohibited from insulting or offending him with abusive language, such as calling him a baldheaded person. He was not required to follow the usual mourning rites following the death of his parents.

There was another way by which a novice might obtain the monk certificate, this was ordination through the grace of the emperor, which usually took place on special occasions, such as the birthday of emperors, granting of official recognition to a temple or monastery, or imperial visits to a certain temple. On such an occasion, the abbot of the monastery would present the names of certain novices as candidates for monk certificates to the district officials, who in turn would submit the list to the Bureau of Sacrifices. Upon approval by the Bureau of Sacrifices, the documents would be granted to the individuals recommended.

Briefly, this was the way matters stood concerning the monk certificates during the early years of the Sung dynasty. As external pressures along the northern frontiers increased, so did the demand for more soldiers in the armies. Tax burdens became heavier and heavier as a consequence. People very naturally looked around for ways and means to escape from being taxed or drafted into labor battalions or the army. Two classes of society did not have to fulfill these responsibilities, officialdom and the monastic community. Of the two, it was more difficult to break into officialdom, hence people turned to the Buddhist church for refuge. However, one had to possess a monk certificate before he could claim exemption from taxation and the labor and military services. Such a certificate became a valuable document, and as demands arose, corrupt officials in the Bureau of Sacrifices were not lacking who sold such certificates at a price. Such was indicated in a decree of 1002, which called upon those who had surreptitiously bought

certificates from the Bureau of Sacrifices to surrender these within a month. Moreover, when the Bureau of Sacrifices issued certificates to those who had obtained them through the regular channels, it charged a nominal sum of 100 cash to cover expenses of printing and handling. Now, in view of this background, and as the demands for revenue increased, it became relatively simple for the Bureau of Sacrifice to take the next step, to proclaim it as a national policy to sell the monk certificates, especially since precedence for such a step was not lacking during the T'ang dynasty.

It is generally agreed that the sale of certificates began in 1067. In that year, a batch of 100 certificates was dispatched to the fiscal intendant of the frontier province Shensi, and in the following year the certificates were put on sale. These certificates differed from those obtained through regular channels only in the fact that there were blank spaces left for the purchaser to fill in the necessary information. In the beginning the number of certificates sold ran to about 3000–4000, but in the decade after 1075, it usually exceeded 9000. In 1075, the number was 9108; 1076, 9364; 1077, 9393; 1078, 9306; 1079, 9942. In 1080, it dropped to 6394, and in the next year there was a further drop to 4198, but it rose up to 9897 in 1082, then 9127 in 1083. It was during this year that a maximum limit of 10,000 was established by the government, but this figure was no sooner set than it was broken, for during the first four months of 1084, 26,000 certificates were put on sale. With the advent of the twelfth century, the maximum limit was raised to 15,000 in 1108, and 30,000 in 1110. For the year 1132, between 50,000–60,000 certificates were said to have been sold. From 1142 to 1161, the sale was suspended as military expenses were not so urgent during that interval. This was the period when the prime minister, whose name has been castigated by Chinese for generations later, Ch'in K'uei, leader of the appeasement party, was in power. One of his first acts was to recall from the northern front General Yueh Fei, who had been uniformly successful against the Chin armies, and to execute him. Ch'in K'uei's appeasement policy bought an uneasy peace for a few years, but in 1161 the Chin troops again began their moves along the northern frontiers, and that year coincided with the resumption of the sale of monk certificates. The demand for

certificates which had been dammed up during the past two decades now burst out again, and between 1161 and 1170, it was estimated that over 120,000 certificates were issued and sold.

When the certificates were first offered for sale, the selling price as established by the government was 130 strings of cash each. Before we proceed any further, it might be well to explain these monetary terms. One cash was one *wen*, usually a coin with a square hole in the center. A string of cash consisted of 770 cash strung together, and was the prevailing unit in counting sums of money. Merely reporting the number of strings of cash does not mean very much to us, however, so I shall try to convert the strings of cash into the amount of rice or silk that they could buy in the contemporary market, using the meager bits of information concerning market prices found in the Sung records. The results are sometimes startling and hard to believe, but if we keep in mind the onerous tax and labor burdens which the male adults had to bear, then the price of the monk certificates would not seem to be excessive, for once the certificate was obtained, then the individual would enjoy exemption for the rest of his life. Probably this is the place to say something also about the complicated and elaborate tax system of the Sung dynasty, just to give you an idea of what the individual sought to avoid. In the beginning, the following were the main categories of taxes: (1) tax in kind on the public lands; (2) tax in kind on privately-owned lands; (3) tax on houses and land in the towns and cities; (4) a sort of poll tax on all male adults 20–60 years of age; (5) a miscellaneous tax on local products. Besides these, there were also taxes on business, tea, salt, wine, etc. On the whole it was felt these taxes during the early part of the Sung dynasty were not too burdensome on the people. For instance, taxes on land averaged about 10 per cent of the annual harvest. Beginning with the era 1068–1077, the situation began to change for the worse, the national treasury became more and more in need of funds, which called for more and more taxes. It was no mere coincidence that the sale of certificates commenced at just about this time. With the removal of the capital to Hangchow in 1138 the territory controlled by the Southern Sung dynasty was reduced by about 50 per cent, but the need for revenue to resist invasion was even more urgent, with the

result that the taxes became more and more burdensome on the populace. All kinds of new taxes were inaugurated, and old taxes were increased. Some of these new taxes were really surtaxes imposed by local officials to meet quotas of revenue fixed by the national authorities, such revenue to be used mainly for military expenses. One such tax was known as the *ho-ti* (non-compulsory purchase). The evolution of this tax is very revealing. In the beginning, the government bought such items as rice or grains from the people and voluntarily paid for them with cash according to the market value. Later the price paid was lower than the market quotations, not in cash but with paper currency or monk certificates or other equivalents. In the end the government made no restitution for the grains taken from the people, considering them has a sort of legitimate tax. The granary tax evolved in about the same manner. At first granaries were established by the government to be filled by contributions from the people, as insurance against famines or drought. As time went on, however, these contributions gradually assumed the status of a permanent tax, to be collected whether or not there were famines or droughts. For every two *tou* of grains paid as the regular tax, one extra *sheng* (there are ten *sheng* in one *tou*) was levied as the granary tax. In addition to the taxes paid to the national treasury, there were yet the local taxes, levied to maintain the expenses of local government. For these there were no limits, they were subject only to the whims of the local officials. We shall mention just one example of such levies, the *chia-hao-ch'ien*, extra-wastage money. When taxes were paid in the form of grains to the central government, there was always the risk that some portion of the grain would be eaten by birds or mice during storage or transportation, so that the amount finally delivered to the government might be less than the amount collected from the people. This loss would have to be made up by the tax collecting officials. To insure against such a contingency, the local officials usually collected more than the required amount, about 10 per cent more. This was known as the extra-wastage tax. As time passed, the original purpose of this extra-wastage tax was forgotten, but it was still levied, and came to be regarded as a permanent tax. The extra-wastage tax was often not sent to the national treasury but kept by the

local government. The amount was increased also until it reached about 50 per cent of the grain tax in some areas. However, the most burdensome and fearful were the services required of each individual. The Sung army was recruited in a variety of ways, by drafting, voluntary enlistments, and forcible enlistments. In any family with two or more sons, one was subject to be called into the army. As for the labor services, the most objectionable was to be called upon for compulsory service in the local yamen. Once drafted for such duties, the individual faced long years of service as underlings or messengers of local officials, as caretakers or watchmen over government property or business, as tax collectors, as watchmen over government goods in transit, or as policemen to catch thieves or suppress banditry. If one were charged with the collecting of a certain amount of taxes, he must produce the required amount, even if he had to pay out of his own pocket. Similarly, if he were sent to assist in the transportation of goods, usually salt, he very often had to foot his own expenses. Or when there was any loss or breakage of government property entrusted to his care, he had to make up the damage or loss. Because of these requirements whole families were often reduced to bankruptcy and pauperism. Contemporary records describe some of the extreme measures taken by people in order to avoid such services. Some would cause their widowed mothers to marry again, others saw their fathers commit suicide, for it was one of the vagaries of Sung law that any family with only a single adult would be exempted from the service requirements. Besides service in the local yamen, male adults might also be called upon to form the labor battalions to assist the armies along the frontiers.

Now that we have some idea of the tax burden, let us resume our discussion of the price of the certificates. In 1068, the current price per bolt of silk was 1300 cash, the price of rice in Central China was about 800 cash per bushel or *shih*. For 130 strings of cash, the official price of one certificate, one could buy 75 bolts of silk, or about 125 bushels of rice. This was indeed a heavy price to pay for the certificate. In 1089, the price rose to 170 strings of cash, the equivalent of about 145 bushels of rice or 85 bolts of silk; in 1101, it was up to 220 strings, equal to about 115 bolts of silk or 170 bushels of rice. In 1161, when sale was resumed after

two decades of suspension, the price rose to 510 strings, equal to about 100 bolts of silk in East Central China. For a while, the price fluctuated between 400–500 strings, until in 1185 it rose to 700 strings, and in 1192, 800 strings. The above figures were the official selling price established by the government, but it sometimes happened that the actual selling price in the open market was much lower, probably due to the government releasing too many certificates at one time. Thus in 1110, when the official selling price was 220 strings, the actual selling price in some areas was only 90 strings, the equivalent of 60 bolts of silk; in 1120, official price was 220 strings, the actual selling price was down to 60 strings, equal to 20 bolts of silk or 15 bushels of rice in Central China. When the official price during the period 1127–1131 was 120 strings, the market price was as low as 30 strings, equal to 7 bushels of rice or 10 bolts of silk. However, in some areas, notably Szechuan, when the official price was 130 strings, the actual selling price was up to about 300 strings during the period 1068–71. Since the actual market price was much lower than the official rate, sometimes being only about one-fourth of the latter, the certificates became available to families who might not have been able to afford them at the official price.

Just how much revenue did the sale of certificates bring to the treasury? Some attempts have been made to estimate this income, using the official prices as the basis of calculation. But since the actual selling price was often lower than the official price, any estimates based on the latter would be manifestly erroneous. Let us take the year 1110 as an example, during which 30,000 certificates were said to have been sold. The official price was about 200 strings, so that if the entire number were sold at that price, the income would have been 6,000,000 strings. But since the market price in some areas was only 90 strings, then some deduction must be made from the above amounts. It is of course impossible to estimate how much to deduct, for we do not know how many were sold at the official price, and how many at the market price. As to the revenue derived from other forms of taxation, we note that the excise on salt brought in 4,000,000 strings annually during the period 1086–93; the excise on tea collected during the period 1111–1117 was also around 4,000,000 strings annually. We may

therefore conclude that the sale of monk certificates, along with the tax on salt, wine, tea, etc., constituted one of the main sources of cash income for the state.

At first these monk certificates were manufactured out of yellow paper. As these were easily susceptible to forgery, false certificates soon found their way to the market, so, beginning with 1129 according to one source and 1137 according to another, silk gauze was used for the purpose. This immediately gave rise to a shortage of silk gauze, and imperial orders were hurriedly dispatched to some of the silk producing areas, especially the T'ung-ch'uan circuit, to rush 10,000 bolts. After that, practically all the silk gauze produced in that one district was used exclusively for the certificates. The manufacture of these certificates was entrusted to the Directorate of Imperial Workshops. In order to assure uniformity in the appearance of the certificates, the use of ornamented gauze was prohibited; only gauze which was stamped with the approval of the Imperial Workshop was utilized. For those who had acquired certificates made of yellow paper, they were permitted to have them exchanged for ones made of gauze, upon payment of a fee of 10 strings of cash, designated as a fee to cover expense of labor and ink.

According to the original idea back of the certificate, the possession of such a document was evidence that the owner was an officially ordained monk, permitted to shave his head, wear the clerical robe, and claim exemption from taxation and the labor and military services. Now that these certificates were being sold, it was no longer necessary for the possessor to shave his head or to wear the clerical robe or to retire to a monastery in order to claim exemption. Possession of the certificate automatically entailed exemption, and the claim was recognized by the state. The certificate therefore did not imply the necessity to become a monk, the owner could carry on his secular activities just as before. It was this feature that brought about the great demand for the certificates. Since the certificates commanded a certain price in the market, either at the official price or at the current selling price, they soon became accepted as a medium of exchange, especially during occasions and in areas where cash was scarce. Sometimes they were even used by the local officials to purchase things

or to pay for expenses of their local offices. The rich and the well-to-do, therefore, bought these certificates, often not to become monks, but to enjoy the exemptions, and also to keep them (the blank ones) as a form of wealth, a government bond, so to speak, to be sold again when prices were favorable. According to the law, these certificates were to be collected by the abbot of a monastery upon the death of a monk, and returned to the Bureau of Sacrifices, to be stored up and then burned when a sufficient pile had been accumulated. But now under the Sung, with these certificates in great demand, seldom did they find their way back to the state; they were usually obtained by other people, who would erase the name of the deceased and then sell the document to others, though such a practice was considered illegal by the government.

While it is true that there were many who bought the certificates just to claim exemptions, there were also some who did purchase them to become monks. The motives of such people in joining the sangha were varied. Some were sincerely attracted by the calm religious life within the monasteries, and the purchase of a certificate was a most easy avenue to attain that goal, without any need of preliminary training and examination. Others probably were actuated by more worldly motives; the prospect of being fed and clothed without doing any physical labor was rather attractive, to say the least. Then there were those who were guilty of some crimes and wanted to escape from the law. Ever since the period of Disunity (4th and 5th centuries) the Buddhist monasteries had occupied a special position in legal matters, and were not touched by secular laws. Offenses concerning monks were settled in accordance with monastic law, except when a monk murdered another person, in which case the guilty was to be tried under civil laws. Monastic laws were on the whole much more lax than the civil laws, for the heaviest penalty inflicted upon a monk was expulsion from the order. Whatever the motive, the result was an increase in the number of duly registered monks and nuns. One source indicated that in 1125 there were over a million Buddhist and Taoist monks, but in all likelihood, this is an overestimate.

This is probably the place to describe in a few words the method

of preparing the monk register, which started in 729. Such a registry was to be compiled once in every three years, and was to be recorded in three copies, one to be kept in the Bureau of Sacrifices, one in the Court of State Ceremonials, and one in the local prefecture. The practice was continued under the Later Chou dynasty, with one modification. In addition to the compilation of the master registry every three years, there was to be an annual count made by the local officials after the 15th day of the 4th month, the figures to be sent to the Bureau of Sacrifices, where they were checked against those in the master registry. Changes due to death, new ordinations, return to laity, etc. were then noted in the proper places. This procedure was followed by the Sung authorities.

The income derived from the sale of such certificates was used by the state for various purposes. By necessity the bulk was expended on military needs, such as protection of the frontiers, enlistment of soldiers, construction of forts, etc. However, it appears that the revenue was used also for the following purposes: to alleviate famine; to construct city walls and moats, granaries, temples, ancestral halls, palaces; to improve irrigation projects such as river control, repairing dikes, deepening rivers and harbors; and to encourage industry by providing capital for various commercial enterprises.

One inevitable consequence of the sale of certificates was of course the lowering of the caliber of monks who entered the monastic community. Under the monk examination system, the candidate had at least to demonstrate some knowledge of the sacred scriptures. Now no such requirement was necessary, all one needed was the proper sum of money to buy the certificate. It was possible therefore to find within the monastic community members who had no knowledge of the tripitaka or what the religious life meant. Prestige of the sangha therefore declined under such circumstances. This lowering of prestige was augmented by another practice of the Sung dynasty, the sale of the title Master of the Purple Robe.

The practice of conferring this title was started by the Empress Wu Tse-t'ien of the T'ang dynasty, a capable and ambitious woman who usurped the T'ang throne, and then claimed to have

found in a Buddhist sutra the ideological basis to justify her assumption of power. Consequently, during the twenty years, 685–705, when she held imperial powers, she favored Buddhism over all other religions. She first conferred the title Master of the Purple Robe as an honor to her favorite monk Huai-i and his followers. The monk Huai-i was commonly believed to have been the one who forged the Buddhist sutra which the Empress used to justify her usurpation, and who was permitted to enter the imperial precincts at will any time during the day. Possession of the title permitted the holder to wear a purple-colored clerical robe, purple being the color reserved for high ranking officials. Being different in color from the approved clerical garment, it was not looked upon with much favor by the monks at first, but as succeeding emperors continued to confer the title as an honor, and as it was the highest honor which the state could bestow on a monk, it gradually became an object of desire for those clerics who sought after worldly favors and honor. During the early Sung dynasty, the title was granted to those monks who were able to answer correctly ten questions on the tripitaka. Afterwards, on the occasion of an imperial birthday, monks were recommended by imperial princes or high officials for examinations on the scriptures, and the successful candidates were awarded the title. Moreover only those who had been ordained for more than five years were eligible. Those monks over 80 years of age were automatically the recipients of the title. It appeared that the title was also granted to those Chinese monks who had travelled abroad in search of the scriptures or who had assisted in the translations of sutras, and to those foreign monks in China who were active in spreading the law or in assisting in translation activities. In order to indicate the different grades in the honorary title, two, four, or six additional characters were affixed to the title, the more characters the higher the honor. Thus on the whole the title was not easy to obtain during the early Sung period. This very feature, coupled with the prestige attached to the title, of course stimulated the desires of those monks interested in fame and honor, and soon evil practices began to be resorted to in order to acquire the title. Ambitious monks were now willing to pay for the privilege of having the title, and so it was just a matter of time before the

Sung authorities, ever ready to reap a few strings of cash, would put the title on sale. We do not know just when sale of the title started; it probably occurred simultaneously or soon after the sale of monk certificates, for we have an entry dated 1071 recording that in that year the fiscal intendant of Hopei received 500 monk certificates and 250 titles, Master of the Purple Robe, to be sold in his area, the proceeds to be used for river conservation and repair of dikes. In the case of the monk certificates, the buying clientele was very large, since it was the common people who wanted to evade taxation. As the title Master of the Purple Robe could be borne only by monks, it was sought after only by monks, and since the demand for it was much less than that for the certificates, its selling price was much lower. In spite of this, however, it appears that not many titles were sold. Thus, in the middle of the twelfth century, when the sale of monk certificates was suspended by the Sung authorities, the sale of honorary titles continued as before, since it was felt that such sale had no harmful effect on the common people, but was beneficial to the country instead. Because of the paucity of information on this subject, I have not been able to find out what the actual selling price was during the different periods, or how many such titles were sold. There are a few scattered notices, however, which indicate that around 1130 the title with two characters sold for one hundred strings of cash, that with four characters for two hundred strings. Again, we are told that in 1129, five thousand titles were sold, with the proceeds being turned over to the military, and in 1134, two thousand five hundred titles were sent to each of four governor-generals for sale.

In view of the need for revenue faced by the Sung government, it may be argued that the authorities were aggravating their problem by promoting the sale of monk certificates. Thus during the early years of the Southern Sung when resistance to the Golden Hordes required large sums of money for defense, some 50,000 monk certificates were sold annually. While the government received the revenue from such sale, it was also true that an equal number of male adults would be withdrawn from the tax rolls, thereby depriving the government of the amount of tax income which it would normally collect from those male adults. Thus

while the needs of the government were constantly growing, the number of people bearing the tax burdens would be decreased by the growing body of people holding monk certificates. In a district there would be about a thousand, in a commanderie, about 10,000, so complained one chronicler. This large body of tax exempts, including the monks, was not contributing anything toward the welfare of the state, and it was a situation which the Sung authorities felt could not be tolerated. It was not surprising therefore that the Sung government soon came up with another scheme to raise funds from the sangha. As early as the T'ang dynasty, it had already been proposed that all monks not yet 50 should contribute 4 bolts of silk, nuns 2 bolts to the state; those over 50 should be exempted. This proposal was not accepted, however. Now, in 1145, the Southern Sung authorities proceeded to impose a tax on all members of the Buddhist sangha, known as a payment for the privilege of being exempted from taxation and military and labor services, sometimes euphemistically called a payment to enjoy leisure. With the imposition of such a tax, of course the tax exempt status of the monk was abrogated. It is true that he was exempted from the ordinary tax burdens and the labor services, but he had to pay a tax to enjoy these exemptions. Monks were divided into different categories according to the type of monasteries to which they were attached and their personal status.

Type of Monk	*Monastery concentrating on vinaya and sutra*	*Zen Monastery*
Ordinary monk	5	2
Master of the Purple Robe	6	3
Master of the Purple Robe with two characters	6	3
Master of the Purple Robe with four characters	8	5
Master of the Purple Robe with six characters	9	6
Temple officials below abbot	8	5
Abbot, sangha officials, masters of the law	15	10

It is interesting to note that Zen monks and masters were taxed a smaller amount than masters of the vinaya or masters of the law. Was this lower assessment of the Zen monk due to his being considered inferior in status to others, or was it due to some other consideration? We know for instance that Zen monks under the Sung had to engage in some productive labor, for their slogan was, literally, one day no work, one day no food. It seems therefore likely that the Zen monks paid a lower leisure tax because they were not considered the parasites on society that the others were.

The leisure tax was collected by the Board of Revenue, and a receipt was given upon payment. Monks therefore had to carry, in addition to their monk certificates, this receipt also. The method of collection, however, was rather inefficient, the tax did not yield the revenue expected, and it was difficult to collect. When monk certificates were put on sale and sold in large quantities, inevitably the registry of monks became incomplete, so that many monks whose names were not on the registry escaped the assessment. Then again, monks were constantly on the move. Furthermore, there probably arose some corruption among those officials collecting the tax. For instance, in 1170 an official in the Board of Revenue complained that while the sale of certificates had increased to over 120,000, so that the amount of leisure tax should have been increased proportionately, the receipts from that tax from the local officials were less than those during the period when only 30,000–50,000 were sold. This seems to be clear evidence that the local officials were either pocketing the revenue or that those who purchased the certificates did not join the sangha. Worst of all, there were some indications that monks were even able to obtain exemption from this tax to be exempted from taxation as special favors from some local officials.

The Buddhist sangha under the Sung dynasty, so far as the number of monks and nuns, wealth, and abundance of temples were concerned, compared favorably with conditions under the T'ang dynasty. Yet it did not seem to have played an active rôle in the religious, social, and intellectual life of the nation. The sangha as originally constituted was to be a body of monks without worldly desires, untainted by worldly gains, pure and devoted to the religious life. Yet under the Sung, various aspects of the

sangha had to do with money, gain, or honor. The monk certificates were bought and sold, the honorary titles of monks became an object of commercial transaction. From the point of view of the national treasury, all this was of course only an economic problem, but from the viewpoint of the sangha, it was not only economic but also religious, for it tended to have important implications in the kind of people admitted to the sangha. One would have expected the Buddhist leaders to have lodged a vigorous protest against this policy of the government, yet, as far as we can ascertain, the historical records do not reveal any such protest. One can only conclude that the morale of the Buddhist sangha, the caliber of the Buddhist clerics, the religious temper of the entire Buddhist church, must have suffered a marked deterioration during the Sung dynasty. For this deterioration there were probably many internal and external factors at work. But it seems to me that among the external factors, the continuing economic crisis faced by the Sung dynasty was to a large degree responsible for the decline in the prestige and effectiveness of the sangha. It was because of this economic plight that the dynasty had to resort to the sale of certificates and honorary titles for revenue, and the sale of certificates in turn opened the floodgates for the undesirable elements of society, the riff-raff, fugitives from justice, the lazy, the tax evaders, and the draft-dodgers, etc. to seek refuge in the Buddhist sangha. When people of such caliber and intentions became monks, it was no wonder that the religious temper of the entire sangha deteriorated. No outstanding Buddhist cleric such as Hsuan-tsang or I-tsing, emerged under the Sung, no new school of Buddhism developed, no important Buddhist sutras were translated. The intense intellectual activity within Buddhist circles under the T'ang dynasty, which brought out so many diverse systems of thought, was conspicuous by its absence during the Sung. Instead of the respect and esteem which it enjoyed under former dynasties, the sangha was now looked upon with ridicule and disrespect. This attitude was best illustrated by some of the proverbs current after the Sung dynasty:

When one has no way out, one becomes a monk.

The monk picks up a copy of the scriptures, but he cannot even read it clearly.

When a blind man sees money, his eyes open; when a monk sees money, he will even sell the sacred scriptures.

In front of the gates of hell are many Buddhist monks and Taoist priests.

Among ten nuns, nine are prostitutes, and the remaining one is mad.

While in his mouth there is Amitabha, in his heart there is a nest of poisonous snakes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Sogabe Shizuo, Sō-dai zaisei-shi (Financial History of the Sung Dynasty), Tokyo, 1941.
2. ———, "Sō no do-chō zakkō" (Study of monk certificates under the Sung dynasty), Shigaku zashi 41.6(1930).725–40.
3. Mishima Hajime, "Sō no bai-chō ni tsuite" (Concerning the sale of monk certificates under the Sung dynasty), Shigaku zashi 40.12 (1929).1513–14.
4. Tsukamoto Zenryū, "Sō-chō jidai no zaiseinan to bukkyō-kyōdan" (Economic distress of the Sung dynasty and the Buddhist sangha), Shūkyō kenkyū 7.5(1930).1–30.
5. ———, "Sō no zaiseinan to bukkyō," (Economic distress of the Sung dynasty and Buddhism), Anniversary Volume in Honor of Dr. Kuwabara, Tokyo, 1931, pp. 549–594.
6. Fan Wu, "Sung-tai tu-t'ieh shuo," (A discussion of monk certificates under the Sung), Wen-shih tsa-chih 2.4(1942).45–52.
7. Yuan Chen, "Liang Sung tu-t'ieh k'ao," (Study of monk certificates during the Northern and Southern Sung periods), Chung-kuo she-hui ching-chi-shih chi-k'an 7.1(1944).42–104; 7.2(1946).1–78.
8. Nieh Ch'ung-ch'i, "Sung yi-fa shu" (Corvée under the Sung), Yenching Journal of Chinese Studies 33(1947).195–270.
9. Ch'uan Han-sheng, "T'ang Sung cheng-fu sui-ju yu tai-pi ching-chi ti kuan-hsi" (The Relation between Public Finance and Money Economy during the T'ang and Sung Periods), Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology Academia Sinica 20(1948). 189–221.
10. ———, "Pei Sung wu-chia ti pien-tung" (Price Fluctuations during the Northern Sung dynasty), ibid., 11(1947).337–394.
11. ———, "Nan Sung ch'u-nien wu-chia ti ta pien-tung," (Price

Fluctuations at the Beginning of the Southern Sung Period), ibid., 11(1947).395–423.

12. Sung-shih.
13. Hsu Tzu-chih t'ung-chien ch'ang-p'ien.
14. Sung hui yao kao.
15. Fo-tsu t'ung-chi.
16. Chien-yen i-lai hsi-nien yao-lu.
17. Chien-yen i-lai ch'ao-yeh tsa-chi.
18. Clifford H. Plopper, Chinese Religion Seen Through the Proverb, Shanghai, 1935.

BOOKS RECEIVED

BILLY GRAHAM; the Personal Story of the Man, His Message, and His Mission. *By Stanley High*, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. [1956] 274p. ports.

A DICTIONARY OF MARY, *compiled by Donald Attwater*. New York, P. J. Kenedy & Sons [1956] viii, 312p.

DUMBARTON OAKS PAPERS, Numbers Nine and Ten. *Edited by the Committee on Publications, the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Trustees for Harvard University, Washington, District of Columbia.* Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1956. ix, 316p.

EAST IS EAST; Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity; a Comparison, *by Peter Fingsten*. Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press [1956] xvii, 181p.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN ANCIENT ISRAEL DURING THE TANNAITIC PERIOD (10–220 C.E.). *By Eliezer Ebner*. New York, Bloch Publishing Company, 1956. 128p.

ETHICAL VALUE. *By George F. Hourani*. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press [1955] 233p. tables.

EL EVOLUCIONISMO EN FILOSOFIA Y EN TEOLOGIA: Obra en Colaboración de Varios Especialistas, [*de*] *Pontificia Universidad Eclesiástica, Salamano*. viii, 252p.

FOUNDING THE LIFE DIVINE: an Introduction to the Integral Yoga of Sri Aurobindo. *By Morwenna Donnelly*. New York, Hawthorn Books, Inc., [1956] 246p.

GOODSPEED, Edgar Johnson, 1871–. Modern Apocrypha. Boston, the Beacon Press [1956] ix, 124p.

GUESTS OF GOD; Meditations for the Lord's Supper. *By John Frederick Jensen*. Philadelphia, Westminster Press [1956] 109p.

THE IMAGE, *by Kenneth E. Boulding*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press [1956] 175p. (Knowledge in Life and Society)

JESUITS; Biographical Essays. *Edited by Robert Nash, S.J.* Dublin, M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., 1956. xvi, 230p. front. (port.)

JESUS CHRISTUS ALS ERLOESER IN DER LIBERALEN THEOLOGIE: Vermittlung, Spekulation, Existenzverstaendnis. [*Von*] *Max Huber*. Winterthur, Verlag P. G. Keller, 1956. 307p.

KINGDOM AND CHURCH; A Study in the Theology of the Reformation, *by T. F. Torrance* . . . Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd [1956] viii, 168p.

MASTER ALCUIN, LITURGIST; a Partner of Our Piety. [*By*] *Gerald Ellard* . . . Chicago, Loyola University Press, 1956. xiii, 266p.

THE MOMENT BEFORE GOD. [*By*] *Martin J. Heinecken*. Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press [1956] cvii, 181p.

THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF PRIESTHOOD; a Comparative and Anthropological Study, *by E. O. James* . . . New York, Vanguard Press [1955] 336p.

OUR REASONABLE FAITH. [*By*] *Herman Bavinck* . . . Grand Rapids, Michigan, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956. 568p.

THE PROTESTANT WAY. [*By*] *Kenneth Hamilton*. Fair Lawn, N.J., Essential Books, Inc., 1956. 264p.

THE ROLE OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE CATHOLIC LIBERAL COLLEGE; Volume XXX, Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association held at Hotel Netherland Plaza, Cincinnati, Ohio . . . April 3 and 4, 1956. *Charles A. Hart, Editor Secretary of the Association.* Washington, D.C., Issued by the Office of the Secretary of the Association, the Catholic University of America. 247p.

ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL; a Commentary. *By R. H. Lightfoot. Edited by C. F. Evans.* With the Text of the Revised Version. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1956. xii, 368p.

SCRITTI PATRISTICI. [*Per*] *Antonio Casamassa.* Romae, Facultas Theologica Pontificii Athenaei Lateranensis, 1955–1956. 2 v. (Lateranum. Nova Series, An. XXI, N. 1–4; An. XXII, N. 1–4)

THE SEMANTIC DEVELOPMENT OF GLORIA IN EARLY-CHRISTIAN LATIN. *by A. J. Vermeulen.* Nijmegen, Dekker & van de Vegt, 1956. xxii, 236p. (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva; studia ad sermonem Latinum Christianum pertinentia, 12)

SUBJECT AND OBJECT IN MODERN THEOLOGY. [*By*] *James Brown.* New York, Macmillan Company, 1955. 214p. (The Croall Lectures given in the University of Edinburgh, 1953) (Library of Philosophy and Theology)

THE WAY OF JESUS: *by Charles Edwards Park.* Boston, Starr King Press, [1956] ix, 109p.